

ARRIGNED
TO M. JEWELS
REPLIE.

By perusing wherof the discrete and diligent Reader may easily see, the Answer to parte of his insolent Challenge, and his Obiections against the same, wherunto the Author hath time receiued the holy Spirit, without any great companie to receive with him, for that cause by his others Schoole called Synagogue, clearly confuted.

By Thomas Harding Doctor of Divinitie.

Proverb. 25.

Nubes, & ventus, & pluvia non sequentes, aut gloriosus, & promissus non complens.

As the air is a cloude, and wind, and no rain following: So is a man, that vaunteth much, and performeth not his promises.



ANTVERPIAE
Ex officina Joannis Foulers
Anno. M. D. LXVI.

Regia Maiestatis Priuilegio per-
missum est Thomæ Hardingo Do-
ctori Theologo librum ab se conscriptum
hoc titulo, *A l'incroyable de St. Aruels l'aplic, &c. cui-*
cunq̃ velit ex typographis iuratis qui in Bur-
gundica Ditione habitant, typis excuden-
dum committere, atq̃ eius seu cuiuscunq̃ al-
terius opera ad exemplaria distrabenda
uti. Datum Bruxellis. 20. Maij.
Anno. 1566.



Subsig.
Pratz.



TO THE READER



Wish that I am not suffred Christian Reader,
by vse of tongue to speake freely and openly
in defence of the matter which concerneth thy
soule health, by M. Jewels late Replis im-
pugned: let it be lawfull for the Truth, by
secrete way of written treatises, to come vnto
thy eares. That thou maist the better iudge of the whole, con-
sider wisely the oddes of both our present states. We haue al
the helpes, that in respecte of the worlde to the furtherance of
such purpose can be desired, libertie to speake, vse of the pulpits,
sanour of the time, benefite of the lawes, the sway of the worlde,
the inclination of many hartes, besides al these, his owne pecu-
liar pleasant eloquence. I on the other side, lacke al these.
My voice is not heard, the pulpit is denyed, the time is contra-
ry, the lawes threaten, the worlde frowneth, hartes repine, suche
kinde of eloquence serueth not, nor is at al affected.

What is there then whereof in this enterprise I
comforte my selfe? Soorthly in the right of the cause, not
doubting, but through Goddes power, naked Truthe
shall

To the Reader.

shal in the ende ouercomme armed falshed. But our Aduersaries say, the Truth is of their side, and not of oures. Therefore to make credite, they reporte them vnto M. Jewels Replie. But what if as his Challenge was vaine, so now his Replie also be founde vnttrue, yea nothing els in manner, but a continual corruption of the Doctours, and a heape of lyes? That remaineth to be proued. I affirme, M. Jewel denieth. By whom shal we be iudged?

Here I must tel thee Reader by way of necessary digression, that for asmuch as Sathan hath now put in his foote, and plaied his parte, onlesse thou take good herbe, and pray that thy harte may be staied with grace: thou arte in great danger to be deceiued, to be carried away into errours and heresies, and finally to lose the rewarde which is laid vp for the obedient children of the Church of Christe, and to haue thy portion with the rebellious synagogue of Antichriste.

What is then the parte that Sathan hath plaied? Marke, and consider. It is the breach of order. We seeth, that so long as due order is kepte in the Church, his deuises for heresies to be spied abroad, can not preuaile. Wherefoze with all endenour he hath euer gone about to translerre the iudgement concerning Doctrine of Religion, which is the key of order, from the lawfull and ordinarie iudges, vnto others, to whose vocation no such auctoritie belongeth. And this hath he now brought to passe through his Ministers in diuerse Countreies of Christendom. Albeit they agree not among them selues. For some appoint Princes to be iudges, some the common people, some euerie private man, so he be a member of the Church.

If thou wilt not be deceiued, be not thine owne iudge, heare &

Brentius
in prolego-
menis Co-
tra Petru
à Sero.

To the Reader.

Catholike Church. Stand to the iugement of the, whom the holy
ghost hath ordeined bishops (as S. Paul saith) to gouern þ church
of god, which he hath purchased with his blood. Heare them, to
whom Christ said, It is not you that speak, but the spirit of your fa-
ther that speaketh in you: He that heareth you, heareth me, he that
despiseth you, despiseth me: To whom finally he said, I am with
you al daies vnto the ende of the worlde. That thou shouldest
be assured where to finde right iudgement touching causes of
faith, Christ spake not thus to Princes, nor to the priuate people,
nor to euery priuate man, but to the Apostles onely. Now
wherelas the Apostles liued but the time of common life, and re-
maine not vpon the earth vntill the end of the worlde: It is most
certaine, that he would these wordes to be vnderstanded of their
lawful successours: which he shewed also most clearly when he
said: I wil beseech my Father, and he shal geue you an other com-
forter, to remaine with you for euer, the spirit of truth. Where-
fore if thou seeke for sure iugement, whereby in controuersies
and doubties in religion thou maist with safetie of thy conscience
be resolued, heare the Spirit of Christ speaking in the ordina-
rie gouernours of his Church.

A& 10.

Mat. 10.

Mat. 28.

Ioan. 14.

Neither let thy misliking of their life, if any do amisse,
ingender in thee discredit of their iudgement touching doctrine.
hereof our heavenly Master (as S. Augustine saith) hath geuen
a forewarning, to thintent he might put the people in securitie of
their euil gouernours, that for their sakes the chair of holosome
Doctrine should not be forsaken, in which euil men be forced to
say good thinges. For neither be the thinges which they speake
theirs, but Gods, who in the chaire of vnitie hath placed the do-
ctrine of veritie.

August. ad
Donatist.
Epist. 164.

To conclude, touching al pointes of Religion, by what

* iii.

Conse

To the Reader.

Esai. 62.

Confistorie can we be iudged, if we go from the Catholique Church of God, where by his owne woorde we are assured of his wil? For of the Church thus saith God by the prophete Esay: Thou shalt be called by a newe name, which our Lord owne mouth shal name. Thou shalt be called no more the forsaken, and thy Lande shal no more be called the desolate (lande) but thou shalt be called, Voluntasmear in ea, My wil in her.

Of Her therefore let vs in al our doubties and controuersies demaunde Gods wil and pleasure. There let vs seeke for it, there we shal finde it. But what neede we to seeke for it? Let vs onely beholde the custome of the Church.

Consider therefore how the case standeth. M. Petwel denieth the real presence of our Lordes body in the blessed Sacrament, he taketh away the singular and external Sacrifice of the Church, he condemneth the Priest for saying Masse not hauing a companie to receiue the Communion in the same place with him, he aboliseth the external Priesthod of the newe Testament, the receiuing of the Communion vnder one kinde, the Latine Service of the Latine Church, the Supremacie of S. Peters Successour, the being of Christs body in many places at one time, the Elevation the Adoration, the Reseruatiō of the same, the pluralitie of Masses in one Church in one daie, secrete pronouncing of the Canon of the Masse, the Canon it selfe, the diuiding of the blessed Sacrament, the vse of Images, Prayer for the dead: al these, and many more great points of Christian religion, and what so euer els almost is vsed and allowed in the Catholique Church, be it of Doctrine, or of Religions obseruation, hee denieth, despiseth, and bitterly condemneth. Yet remember Reader, that
what

To the Reader.

what **M.** Jewel denieth, the Church affirmeth: what **M.** Jewel despiseth, the Church esteemeth: what **M.** Jewel condemneth, the Church Commandeth. But what reasons, what Arguments, what allegations, what shewes of disproofes to tuer he bring against these things, we ought to make smal accompt thereof, forasmuch as we see them appoyned, and allowed by the continual custome of the Church.

In this case any stedfast Christian man, be he neuer so vnlearned, may thus say vnto him selfe: If **M.** Jewel kepe him selfe in the vnitie of the Church, I holde with him: If he teach contrary doctrine, if he make him selfe wiser then the whole Church, if he tel me that is Idolatrie, and superstition, which (as I vnderstand and see) the Church hath vniuersally vsed as a Service donne vnto God: there I leaue him, there I forsake him. For if the wil and pleasure of God be alwaies in his Church, as by purpoise of that newe name geuen vnto her by Gods owne mouth, I say doth vs to vnderstande: if Christe remaine al daies vnto the worldes ende with the Successours of his Apostles, for the safe gouernement of his Church as the Scripture saith: if the heauenly Father at his Sonnes prayer haue geuen vnto the Church the holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, to remaine with her for euer: if at this be true, as by Gods woorde we know it to be most true: let **M.** Jewel make hye Challenges, and great Replies, let him sette his mouth against heauen, let him utter the whole Roie of his Reason, let him seme to speake like an Angel, yea if he were an Angel from heauen: I would beleue the Church, him I would not beleue: yea being the enemy of the Church, & condemning so many things appoyned, vsed, taught & commaunded by the Church,

Mat. 28.
Ioan. 14.
Esa. 59.

Psal. 72.

Galat. 1.

To the Reader.

I would blesse my selfe from him, as from the disciple of Antichrist, as from the Minister of Satan, as from Gods open and professed ennemie.

Who so euer is at this point with M. Jewel, he shal not be deceiued by M. Jewel. Els if he seeke to be resolued in these, & other maters of faith & religio, which our Aduersaries wouldaine cal into controuersie, by other meanes, as by his owne wit, by conference of their treatises, who haue written on both sides, by the opinion of private men whom he esteemeth and loueth, and by course of the times that he liueth in: onlesse he be learned, it is moze then likely, that he shal wauer too and fro, be carried from one opinion to an other, & haue a mutable faith, or rather no faith at al, but onely a wandering phantasie. Therefore the surest way is, in al these doubtles to stand to the determination of the Church. As for the moze parte of the thinges by M. Jewels Challenge condemned, let no man pretende ignorance of her determination: the custome of the Church sheweth to euery mans eye, be he neuer so simple, the same to be approued.

1. Tim. 3. If then these maters whereupon he hath made his Challenge, be brought to that Consistorie, and to that seate of iudgement, whereunto al controuersies ought to be referred, I meane the Catholique Church, the pillar and sure stae of truth, in which the holy Ghoste the spirit of truth is resident: if our Aduersaries would condescend hereunto, we should soone be at accord. But thereto they wil neuer yelde. For so be they sure, sentence should go against them, as it hath ener heretofore. And because they knowe so much, as al Heretiques haue euere known: therefore S. Ihuans saith of euery such a one, He is condemned by his owne iudgement.

Tit. 3.

For

To the Reader.

For this cause the face and the name of the Church, hath ever been terrible unto all Heretikes.

As concerning the Doctrines of the Church, like as the Jewes cannot be overcome by the Scriptures of the new Testament, for that they do not admit them into their Canon of authentical Scriptures, nor acknowledge them, or any part of them: so Heretikes of olde time and these false Gospellers of our time say the same parte, refuse the writings of the holy Fathers, though to promote their owne purpose, sometimes they allege them. The Jewes like against Christ, soe like and spurne against the Church. The Jewes killed Christ, these do what in their power they can, to destroy the Church of Christ.

But to returne from whence I have digressed, by whom shall we be iudged? The iudgement of the Church is refused, especially for almost these 60. yeres past. For these fellows would us to beleue, that after six hundred yeres Christ waxed weary of his spouse the Church, as some men be of their olde wives, and was divorced from her. which opinion is so vaine, so foolish, so wicked, so besides all reason and sense of Scripture, as nothing more, and is of late very sufficiently confuted by him, that worse of Foxe of the faith first planted among vs Englishmen.

The case standing thus, what is now to be done? Christ saith, Who heareth not the Church, let him be unto thee, as a Heathen and a Publican. Therefore in deede I ought not to encounter, but quite to give over the Jewel, & to leave him unto the iudgement of God, as the Church leaue all such as he is, and acknowledge them for none of hers. And this were to be done touching his person. Yet to thicken the danger of his false doctrine may in some persons be said from crying out, and that by shewing the weaknesse of his parte, and the truth of his dealing, the truth be laid forth to the conspect of the Cartho-

Mat. 18.

To the Reader.

When, to the confusion of the Gospellers, I have written against the Replye of his first Article, geuing thee thereby as it were a taste, what were to be looked for, if I would, and thought it expedient, to like some, to examine and confute the whole,

Not as if it is so gentle Reader, that order is broken, and thou contrary to al good order must needs be made iudge here of thy selfe: consider (I require thee) what is thy durie. Remember, thou be not parcial towards either of our persons. Let al affection be laid aside. Let right consciences be the rule both of loue and hatred. Let neither hope, nor feare, haue place in thy heart to winne or lose by either of our fortunes. Let neither his preferment be envied, nor my deprivation pitied. Yea if thou can so conceiue, let our bookes represent vnto thee, not Jewel, and Harding, but two men, John and Thomas departed this worlde, to no man living known to haue spured.

And when thou hast leste of al affection touching our persons, then studie how to discharge thy mynde of al blinde partialitie towards both our doctrines. Iour from thy heart the liking of their Gospel (for so they wil needs cal it) because it is newe, because it is easy, because it semeth pleasant, and geueth more libertie vnto thy lustes. On the other side, let not loathsomenesse of the Catholike religion, which they cal Papistrie creepe vpon thee, because it is olde, because it is austere and hard, because it requireth painefull workes, because it bindeth vs to a strait discipline and order of life, and biddeth the lustes of our flesh. Thus abandon al thy humaine likinges, and carnal phantasies, and with a single eye, and simple harte beholde and embrace, what is good and true, onely for loue of good, and for the Truthe sake.

Being thus disposed, commend thy selfe vnto God with prayer, beseeching him to lighten thy vnderstanding, and by his holp.

To the Reader.

holy Spirit to lead thee vnto the Truth. This done, with
an humble heart read both our Treatises, and Iudge. Yet this
much I say in case of necessity, not so in general, but so cer-
taine, such, as by other means will not be induced to confesse
of the Truth. For otherwise I acknowledge, that both the
Reple, and al other heretical bookes, by order of the Church
without special licence be vnlawful to be read, and accorde-
ly forbidden to be read or kept, vnder paine of excommunication.

whereas thou takest vpon thee Reader, to be Iudge and
Iuror betwixt Mr. Hewel and me: remember the parte of a
Iudge is, to Iudge (as the Lawyers speake) secundum allegata
& probata, that is to say, accordingly as thinges be alleged and
proued. But beware, euerie thing is not proued, for which
authorities be alleged: neither is al made good, which by pro-
bable argumentes seemeth to be concluded.

Allegations must be true, plaine, and simple, neither weakened
by taking away, nor strengthened by putting so of wordes, nor
wrested fro the sense they beare in þ wordes. Als they bewray the
febleness of þ cause, for prouise whereto they be alleged, and also
the great vnnurthy of him, that for furtheraunce of his purpose abu-
seth the. Merely if allegations made prouise of any doctrine, how
soeuer they were brought: the had Mr. Hewel largely proued the
more parte of his negative Articles. For as euery man may see,
with heapes of them his Reple is filled. But if he haue broken
the condition which both right, and common order bindeth vs
vnto, I meane, if he haue corrupted his witness, if he haue
brought in false witness, if he haue most vnnurthy reported his
Doctors, and shamelesly falsified their sayings: then oughtest
thou Reader to geue sentence against him, then is his honestie
sweyned, the is his credite defaced, the is his Challenge quite daf-
fied. And for prouise that verie oftentimes he hath so done, I re-
ferre thee vnto this present Reioindre,

.. ¶ Here

To the Reader.

Here shalt thou finde no small number of places by him falsified, and that in the first Article. Neither is his custome of falsifying and corrupting the Doctours of one only sorte. Sometime he corrupteth a place by clipping parte away, sometime by putting in of his owne. Sometime he altereth the whole by heaving and mangling, sometime by false translating, sometime by laying together partes, that by the authour be laid a sundre: very oftentimes he taketh a peece of a sentence, that seemeth to make for him, & leaveth out that whereby the doubt is dissolved, and the whole matter answered. And as by false sleights he corrupteth wordes, so much worse he corrupteth the sense, by racking and twisting it to piousse of a cleane contrary meaning.

Neither is he the only sleight of falsifying the Doctours sayings (which of al other is a thing very unworthy the profession of a refozming Preacher) but also sundry other sleights. Of some parte of them I thinke good here to put thee in mynd, that being of the same sort warned, thou maist the better iudge of his whole Replie.

At the first he purposed to make his booke huge and great, that so he might gete vnto him opinion of learning, fray me from answering, or weary me in answering. But as we see, the greatest, vessels holde not alwayes the best liquour, nor the largest comes Russe of moste price: so neither many times containe the greatest bookes the best learning. For some colour of vpright dealing, he hath caused my whole Answer to be printed within 7 volume of his Replie, quartering and loosing it by his Diuisions so, as he might take moste advantage. Thereby he maketh resemblance, as though he had left nothing vnanfwered. But hereby that geneth out a more shew, then it performeth truth. For in deede hauing laid forth certaine parcels together, of the whole he taketh some peece, and cullerth out my sayings, or rather certaine

To the Reader.

certaine wordes, & vnto them frameth his Replie. And doing this, he would be sure of ech heape to take vp no more, then he thought he was hable to beare away. And yet how farre he is overcharged, and how he faileth vnder the weight that is laid vpon him, by this Accoindye it shal appeare.

He bindeth vs to conditions, wherunto he standeth not him selfe. Al that we bring, must be fetched from within the first six hundred yeres after Christe. Al our prouses must be taken out of the Scriptures, examples of the primitive Church, Councils, or Doctours only of that age. If we allege ought that is vnder 7 age of nyne hundred and thye scoze yeres, be it but a yere or two: it is void, and of no auctoritie, because it is without the compasse of tyme by him selfe allowed. As though Christ had withdrawen the holy Ghost the spirite of truth from his Church, which he prayde to his Father, that it might remaine with her for ever, suddainly and iump at the ende of the six hundreded yere. For this cause, and vpon this ground, he refuseth the prouse of Masse celebrated without a companie of receiuers together by Iohannes Eleemosynarius that holy Patriarke of Alexandria, alleged out of his life wrytten by Leontius. But he geueth him selfe licence to bring and allege against vs, and for maintenance of his owne strange doctrines, whatsoeuer it be, examples, stories, customes, Canons, Decrees, Gloses, Scholemen, Canonistes, Summistes, al Doctours, al wryters of al ages, olde and young, so they seme to serue his turne, he refuseth none.

I wil not trouble thee here Reader with a long rolle of these names, whome Mr. Jewel commonly allegeth against vs as he pretendeth in other partes of his Replie, making the vnlearned weene, they are famous and auncient Doctours, as one Iohn Belet, William Ockam, one Iohannes de torto collo, as much to say, John with the wype necke, and such other obscure and vn-

known

Esa. 59.
Iohn. 14.

Articulo
primo
In §. 32.
distinction.
pag. 75.

To the Reader.

knowne writers: yet I will not let to put thes to knowlege, of
 what Doctours he hath stooped him self for furnishing forth this
 first Article. which al be farre without the compasse of his first
 six hundred yeres, and most of them lyued within these three
 hundred yeres, and some within memorie of our age. They are
 these, Anselmus, Rupertus, Innocentius tertius, Durandus, Alex-
 ander de Hales, Hugo, S. Thomas of Aquine, Bonaventura, Sco-
 rus, Gabriel Biel, Vincentius in Speculo, Gratian, Hugo Cardina-
 lis, Nicolaus de Lyra, Nicolaus de Cusa, the glose vpon the Ca-
 nis late, Hermannus Contractus, Summa Angelica, Micrologus,
 Bessarion, Eckius, Pighius, Doctor Smyth. These were wel lear-
 ned men, I denie not, and for vertue, and knowledge to be ho-
 noured ech one in his degree: yet be they without *any* Jewels
 compasse, yet be they for the more parte late writers, and young
 in comparison of the first six hundred yeres. wherefore reason
 would he should beate *f* more with vs, alleging sometimes vpon
 iust occasion, not Scholemen or glossers of the basest estimation,
 but men by confession of the whole worlde of excellent learning,
 though of later age then the first six hundred yeres. As for exaple,
 Bessarion is alleged as a witnesse of the custome of the Greke
 Church for pronouncing the wordes of Consecration: *any* Jewel
 holdeth his authoritie in regard of his age, with this scornfull
 note in the margent, *Bessarion a yonge Doctour.*

In *f* cbl.
 Article.

Replie.
 pag. 546.

Article.
 xii. pag.
 487.

And as he useth a more libertie in the allowance of Doc-
 tours him selfe, then he graunteth vnto vs: so he demeaneth him
 selfe touching Councils. The Council of Antisiodorum is light-
 made of, because it was holden thirteen yeres after the first six
 hundred yeres. But he geweth him selfe leane to bring in for him
 Councils, that were longe after, namely the Councils of Ma-
 tiscons, of Cabilo, of Acon, of Lateran, of Constance, of Florence,
 the late Council of Trente it selfe, and many other, in euery one
 of

To the Reader.

of which Counells his doctrine is condemned.

Merely he fareth with me much like, as if in a combat no other weapon agreed vpon to be vsed of vs both, but a sword onely, and that on foote: contrary to lawe of armes in that behalfe, he entered fight, and set vpon me on horse backe, with sword, speare, and shylde, with fift or six bagges like a swart blutter, with his Page at hand to helpe at nede. So in this fight so attaine I victorie, as it seemeth, not to trye out I trith, he furthereth him selfe with al manner of helpes, as it were with weapons, with Examples, Counells, & Dottours of al ages: as though it were so agreed vpon, Admitteth me only to I aide of the first six C. yeres for defence of our cause. which neuertheleste is ynough, & would god according vnto his promise, thereby he would be tried. As he maketh light of what soeuer is brought for proufe of any point out of them that liued after the first six hundred yeres, so he condemneth & denieth very many that be within I compass, namely S. Clemet, S. Dionysius Areopagita, S. Martialis, S. Hippolytus, S. James ~~Agasse~~, S. Chrysostomes ~~Agasse~~, Leotius. which al either I haue here fully proued, or thoroughly disproued I obiections made in their disproufe. As for I storie of Abdias, or rather of Iulius Africanus, he hath sowly & impudently belied. Against Amphilo- chius he vttereth moze spite, & scoone, then learning or reason, albe it if such Misions like not faithles hartes, to godly beleners for defence of the trith in my booke there is ynough besides.

His other shittes be in maner infinite. He denieth sundy Doc- tors, yet to the same he runneth for helpe. The Decrees & De- cretal Epistles he condemneth altogether, the same he vseth very commonly, & to sundy purposes. How weakely he disproueth the, here shalt thou finde. The ancient Fathers, where their only names for credite sometime I recite without reherfal of their words, as the custome of writers is, he calleth *Mummers*. Yet such *Mummers* he bringeth in him selfe very often.

To the Reader.

He maketh his aduantage of the objections, that he set forth by Innocentius tertius, Scotus, Bonauentura, and other Scholemēn against the Truth, as though they were the censure and received doctrine of the Church. He allegeth the Schismaticke Greekes touching the point of Consecration, as though their errour were of good authoritie. He allegeth them against the Masse, that openly impugne the Masse, as Gerardus Lorichius, and Georgius Cassander: as though the slanderous wordes of the enemies of the Church, were to be heard against the Church. He might as wel haue alleged Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Caluine, Peter Martyr, Cranmarche, and Hooper, against the real presence.

He falsifieth and peruertereth my wordes almost euerywhere, and when he hath made me to say, that he would saue I sayd, and say not in derder: then he taketh on, & triumpheth, as though he had me at greates aduantage. He forgeth precisely and light argumentes of his owne head, such as a childe would not make, and laugheth at them him selfe, pretending them to be made by me. This is very common in him, specially in certaine the first Articles, where he thought by lyke to winne great praise by the arte of scoffing.

When he commeth to dispute and reason in earnest, the greatest grace he hath, standeth in denying one truth by the affirmation of an other truth: As for example, In sundry places of his first Article he maketh much ado to proue, that the Communion in olde time was receiued of many, which no man denieth: and thereof concludeth the denial of the Masse without Companie receiuing with the Masse, whereas both may wel be granted.

Because the vertue of Christes Sacrifice vpon the Crosse endureth for euer, and is thereof by some called the euertlasting

To the Reader.

Sacrifice : thereof he concludeth, the Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christe in the Masse not to be the daily Sacrifice of the Church. He saith so here because Christe is eaten by faith and in spirit, thereof he inferreth, that Christe is not eaten in the blessed Sacrament by service of our mouth. Because Christe is corporally in heauen, thereof he concludeth that his body is not vnder the forme of bread. By as good manner of argument he might denie Christe to be God, because he is man.

Whentimes he dissembleth the water presently created, and taketh occasion of a word to enter into an other matter impertinent, as in p. 1. Division, where I say I leane to some Priuile Masse of Luther's Schole (vnderstanding an Masse as it signifieth the Sacrifice to be present) where it was first denied, and so termed by Mathias him self: he sheweth nothing where it was first so named before Luther, but saith much in excuse of Luther (at his conference with the Deuil.

He sheweth in the 3. Division, where I say he pretendeth enemie against priuile Masse in words, but in deed against the Sacrifice commonly called the Masse: there he answereth not the point, but saith much against that is so commonly called. So he rambleth at wordes, & leauieth the special matter. Whentimes he maketh himselfe more, & taketh his pleasure at a word reasonably vied, with his owne imagination drawing it in an otherwise. As where in p. 4. Division I use the terme of winding up the water, he saith of the woundes of winding up, and there he saith it is not so, and saith not so spars upon a clewe, as though either our tongue admitted no metaphorical speeches, or I had spoken of any clewe at all.

Neither in that place only, but thorough his whole booke he entermeth his frolics and mockes, as it were his heere purgall, with such saunce to make it pleasant, & to gaine his readers,

To the Reader

especially those that be belied to that kinde of needy distressed, an ap-
 pertain not only to ease of such cares, but also to reliefe of the
 mi. What grace of writing I receiue, by no means, neither guide
 I it, nor is it thus, though I think it meets to be. The word of
 God would not be let forth without. whole desire to under-
 stand firmly is cold, the same is to be feared by rather by grace
 and true exhortations, then with shames, and strokes.

But when he is pressed with a manifest place, this may be to
 be considered, what offices he denieth. In this, I think a testimo-
 nie for Masse celebrated by S. John Patriarche of Alexandria to
 out a copious of recriminations, is alleged out of beatus, who wrote
 his life. To auoid this euident testimonie, as in a way, as I say,
 what needeth he to say. First he would deface the authenticke
 Frontispiece, the he pretendeth, this Masse was said without a
 pane of his petes, & by falsifying Vincencius in Speculo maketh
 Masse of f age of Mahomet: as though ther had neuer Masse had
 said before Mahomet began to raigne. After this he allegeth
 Decrees of popes, & Councils, & Masse might not be said in Cha-
 pels or private Oratories. If this will not serue, he runneth to
 particulars not mentioned, as head, wine, Consecration, Eucharist
 Altar, Ministers, etc. Then he would it to be doubted who said
 f Masse, f Bishop, f Curate, or the noble man, for of those there
 only f Some maketh mention. And f he goeth to finde fault with
 my translation. And then he creepeth aspece f Greke, where the
 word Masse is not to be found. Said by him f Interpreter was
 no good Latin man. If al this will not serue f matter, he must not
 Misa be f which we call f Masse. Besides al this he maketh it a
 strange case, f I should seeke the Masse at Alexandria. And though
 it be founde there, yet is it not moued by S. Hierome, or S. Au-
 gustine, or by some other Catholike Doctour. If none of these
 Offices would serue the turne, last of al he sayth away as it were
 out.

To the Reader.

out of the feede, and pretendeth he meaneth in his Challenge shalbe
said in open Church, in the face and sight of the people: This
I lay before thy eyes here Reader, as I do hereafter in my Re-
sponde, to thinke by this one example thou mayest conceiue, with
what a sifter I haue to do: Yet read the place, and I trust thou
shalt indage, that I ridde my handes of him wel enough, such de-
fence of Truth, the Truth it selfe ministreth.

But what shal I say any longer in admonishing this
Christian Reader of M. Jewels Spittes, and false heightes?
Read this treatise, and of such ware thou shalt finde some store
and abounds for thee to behold. Be that of late gaue thee warn-
ing to BEWARE OF M. IEWEL, hath detected some, M.
D. HESKINS, and M. DOCTOR SANDER, many moe.
As for the late Treatise intituled A RETVRNE OF VNTRY-
THES VPON M. IEWELS REPLIE, it turneth no small heape
of such stuffe upon him. The number of Vntruthes deteced of
M. Jewels partitoned and counted by M. Doctor Sander,
by the author of the Returne, and by me, amounteth to a thou-
sand and odd. And yet of his six and twenty Articles, onely
foure haue passed our examination: what number of Vntruthes
is like to rise of his whole booke, by this it may easily be con-
ceined. whereas neither Reate, nor Name could withhold him
from uttering such a huge number of Vntruthes in printed booke,
which he knoweth wel should come to the view and exami-
nation of the Churches being looke to see Gods people decei-
ued with false Doctrine: what is it likely he will sticke
to stee in pulpits, where he is sure no man shal controu-
ert him.

If thou haue pleasure in Vntruthes, the Replie may serue thy ap-
petite. If it like thee better to vnderstand Truth, & see Vntruthes
detected

M. Re-
at.
D. Hesk-
ings.
D. Sand-
er.
M. Stap-
leton.

To the Reader.

Detected and confuted: the diligent reading of our booke shal
satisfie thy desire.

The thinges whereby to be most wondered at in *sq. Newel*,
be these. His impudencie in lying, his falsified in corrupting the
Doctors, his continual scoffing, his common running from
the present matter into common places that be impertinent, his
immoderate bragging, his common thrusting away of one truth
by an other truth, his deepe dissembling where he is pressed with
truth, his often leading and raising at the Pope and Cardinals,
his vile, spitefull and blasphemous talke against our holy scrip-
tures. Where in his Reply he blyth with so great exultation, as no
man ever maye.

Many haue thought, and so reported, this Reply to be such
a peece of worke, as neither could, nor would be ever answered.
But wilt thou knowe myne opinion Reader, and what I thinke
of it? Merely I iudge of it in much like soyle as *Annibal* did of
Antiochus Arme. King *Antiochus* mynding to waite upon the
Romains, had caused a great Arme to moue before him in
sight of Captaine *Annibal*, who fled vnto him after he had ben
ouerthrowen by the Romains. whē al had shewed them feires,
as them seemed best, the foot men haue in their colours, & horse-
men sumptuous in their gilded harness, the Captaines al clad
in golde and pearle passing rich: the king reioysing hereat, both
like you this *Sir Annibal*, quod he. There is enough, quod *Ani-
bal*, for the Romains, if they be not insatiable. *Antiochus* looked
for an other answer, thinking so wel an appointed Arme of so
skillfull a Captaine should haue ben praised. But *Annibal*, who
had wel tried the Romains power, knewe al should be but a
playe for them.

Wight so when I consider this glorious Reply, I see there
be Scammer, Sophistrie, Logique, & Rhetorique: there is *Wit-
ting*

To the Reader.

little and humbly: there is lawe both Civile & Canon: there is
Greke and Latine great store: there be stories and fables: there
be Doctors of all sortes olde and newe, the Canonistes and
Schoolmen, the Masters & Summistes: there is gay eloquence,
& significantly talker: there is much iolly sporte, and some sad hypo-
cricke with many a crying out, Blessed be God; O Maister Har-
ding, Alas M. Harding, &c. there be strange speeches, there be as-
serted termes, there be pinching nippes, irksome rutes, scornful
scottes, & spiteful mockes: so be sporte what is there not to greeue
a godly man, to discredit the person of the Adversarie, to cast
a colour of truth upon the cause, but specially to delight and please
the baser sort, as Idlers and idle persons, the Ministers
and their wives, and all other the like vile caitiffs of the people.

But to effeete all is nothing, because there is no force of truth.
It moulteth gaye in the eyes of the deceived friends, in the en-
counter with the learned Adversarie it maketh weak resistance.
It liketh them, that would all be said: were truer: liketh not
them, that can examine what is true. Merely it groweth to the Ad-
versarie great advantage, it means abundance of matter to confute,
more then he would desire.

As it was said of the three hundred valiant men of Sparta,
who fought against so many thousandes of Perses hoste in the
fields of Thermopylae. *vincendo victi sunt*, as much to say, with
overcoming they were overcome: So if the Catholics take
so blinde to resist this Reptile they grow out, the number of the
Unchristians and false parties will rise so infinite, that (I will not
say they are like to be overcome, but) perhaps with abundance
of matter, being loth to let so vile pointes passe without con-
test, they may be encumbered. Certaine it is, rather shal they find
distresse what to leane, then what to touch, what to dissemble,
then what to resist, what to winke at, then what to conuince. It

To the Reader.

euery their finger were a hande, and euery tooth a tongue, ther
were suffice y enough ministered vnto them to confute by writing,
and to deface by preaching. Calling to thy consideration the
great number of Vntruthes which I and others haue dephechen
ded in it, and that within the Compasse of fīne Articles: thou
maist some iudge, of what suffice this Worley was made. A num
ber of pretended Vntruthes he hath obviously scooped vp as notes
in my Answer vnto his Challenge, but how truly, I reposithe me
vnto the Treatise intituled A Returne of vntruthes vnto my I
uels Replie, & to y perhaps shal follow hereafter. But he not ha
gōne this dafce of scooping vp Vntruthes himselfe, we should not
thus haue followed the rownde. For in deede I neuer knew any
such a foolish daunce piped vp before. But it is often true, what
speaketh, what him listeth, sometime heareth, what him listeth.

To confute any parte of the Replie, it is easy. by due examina
tion to say at euery Vntruth, it is painefull. He hath not so much
wring vs with fastnesse of close argumentes, as he encombreth
vs with heape of loose sayings. He presseth not with weight,
but troubleth with number. His blowes come thicke, but his
weapōs lacke edge. Some in olde time likened Logique to the
hand closed together, Rhetorique to the hand stretched abroad.
Thereof it may be obserued, how much we feare this Rhetoricall.
wel may he sweepe duſte frō of our coates with flap of hand: he sh
not hurte our bones w strokes of fistle. The onſet of such an enuoi
mie cannot fray vs, the chasing of him may put vs to some labour.

Touthing the state and issue of the matter in this parte of my
Reioindre specially treated, such it is of private ſquall: remember
Christian Reader for thy better instruction, what is to be under
ſtanden by the name of private ſquall. First it containeth the ſig
nification of the Sacrifice, nexte of the Priestes single or ſole re
ceiuing. If the Sacrifice be ſufficiently proued, and no reason can
be ſhewed, why the Priest may not receiue alone in caſe of others
negli

Private
ſquall,
what ther
by is me
ant.

To the Reader.

negligence (where as of others it may be proued that within *an*. Jewels compasse of peres they receiued alone) what wanteth to special prouofe of *private* Masse: Yet beware thou be not deceived. whereas that which is signified by these two wordes, *Private Masse*, is quiddam compositum, as I may vse *ſ* Schoole terme, I meane a thing consisting of Masse, in asmuch as it signifieth *ſ* Sacrifice, & of receiuing, to this addition that it be single or sole, & without companie (for els receiuing alone or otherwise on the *ſ* Priestes behalfe, is an essentiall parte of Masse, for that the Sacrifice must of necessitie be receiued): *an*. Jewel *ſ* rather to decriue, & to confounde the whole matter, speaketh confusedly of it in respect of both. By denying *private* Masse, he denyeth both. He then that will proue it, must proue both aparte. Now markes *an*. Jewels Sophistrie, to be I bring prouofe for *ſ* Sacrifice, he wranglith upon *ſ* Priestes sole receiuing. when I proue the *ſ* Priestes sole receiuing by examples of antiquitie, which reposit *ſ* direct of the deuout people receiued the blessed Sacrament alone, then he turneth vnto the Masse, and scoffingly demandeth, whether the people, lay men, and women sayd Masse.

For which purpose, to speake exactly, & that wranglers thwarts things be stopped, *ſ* Catholikes thinke good to say, there is no *private* Masse at all in respect of *ſ* Masse it selfe. For as it implieth specially *ſ* Sacrifice, is so common & publike, and ca not be *private*. And whereas it consisteth of Consecration, Oblation, & receiuing, it might neede to be named of the only receiuing. What which *an*. Jewel is so much adde hath impugned, may be called *private* of sole receiuing, *private* Masse reasonably it can not be called. I acknowledge notwithstanding, that the Masse hath of lea-
ues men be some times named *private*, but in a far other sense, to witte, in consideration it is not solemne, or celebrated with publicke solennitie. But that is to be called and accounted *private* for that the *ſ* Priest receiuerth the blessed Sacrament alone, as it

To the Reader.

is taught by Luthers Schoole, it is not granted. It was a tale
one by Sathans craft deuised to beguile simple soules.

whereas by the importunitie of M. Jewels Replie I am
byinen in this treatise many times to name private Masse, re-
member gentle Reader, that where I seeme to acknowledge it,
the same is in respect of the priestes sole receiving, by which the
Masse is not made of lesse vertue or worthinesse. where I seeme
to reprove the terme, therein I have respect to the Sacrifice,
which is not, ne can not be private.

The issue is this, Seeing the Sacrifice is cleare, and a thing
confessed both by testimonie of al $\bar{\text{f}}$ Fathers, and by practice of the
Church, how so ever M. Jewels without groundes or learning
strive against the manifest truth: and likewise seeing it can not be
denied, but that the blessed Sacrament was of olde time, and
may now be received of one alone: what reason have these men
to shewe, why the priest should be debarred from celebrating
Masse, and from receiving alone, when a company is not dispo-
sed to receive with him. To consecrate the body and bloud of
Christe wherein the Sacrifice consisteth, and therefore also to of-
fer it up unto God, by Christes own sufficientie he is comman-
ded, who said, Do ye this in my remembrance. But that he
should not so doo, unless there were a company presently ready to
receive with him: $\bar{\text{f}}$ neither Christ commanded, nor the Apostles
preached, nor any of their Successors, or ancient Father ever
wrote. This prohibition if they be not habile to shewe, let them
ceasse barking against the holy Ghost, by whose grace $\bar{\text{f}}$ Church
is governed, & hath oftentimes celebrated Masse through al the
world these many hundred yeres the priest receiving alone, and
for $\bar{\text{f}}$ same was never controulled until these late yeres, & $\bar{\text{f}}$ by cer-
taine, whose order of life hath declared them to be quite void of
the spirit of God, & to be lead altogether by $\bar{\text{f}}$ spirit of Sathan.

Luc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

To the Reader.

The most they haue to say against vs is, that for the same we haue not many testimonies, nor examples of Antiquitie. For the Sacrifice which is donne in the Masse, we haue Scriptures, examples, testimonies of the auncient and best learned Fathers in great abundance. That the holy mysteries were alwaies received by the priest, that sacrificed, there is no doubt, for that is of the necessitie of the Sacrifice. But whether the priest had alwaies a companie to receiue with him, or sometimes receiued alone: that is a circumstance of a facte, the proufe whereof by manifest testimonies can not with reason be demanded. If we proue the thing, it is contentious to put vs to the proufe of the circumstance. Yet some testimonies for it we haue, and though not many, no maruel, for such circumstances of factes, as it is knowne, be seldom expressed in writing: and certaine it is, that many thinges haue ben donne, which by witness of writers we can not anouch.

When Christe was at a feast in the house of Simon the Leper, whether he dranke wine without water, or water and no wine, or wine tempered with water, neither I, nor M. Jewel, nor any man liuing can proue. what then? Shal we therfore conclude, that he dranke nothing at al? It doth not remaine in any recorde, that Christe, or his Apostles before his Ascension did euer eate flesh, but at the celebration of the Paschal Lambe: Shal we therfore pronounce and say, y before that time they neuer eate flesh? Might so if we could not bring testimonies, that within the first five hundred yeres any priest at Masse receiued the Sacrament without a number receiuing it with him, yet were not that a sufficient argument wherby to proue, there was al that time no such Masse at al. It were reason, that first these men agreed with vs touching the thing it selfe, so the disputation concerning the Circumstance, should procede more orderly. But M. Jewel
of

Matth.

26.

Ioan. 12.

To the Reader.

of purpose seeketh to confounde order, perceiving he shall be unable to set forth some colourable defence of his vaine Challenge, if things be treated confusedly.

To conclude concerning this first Article, whereas the doctrine of the Sacrifice is certaine, and the priests receiving of it essentiall, but whether it be with companie of other receivers, or without companie, ceremoniall, which neither diminisheth, nor increaseth the vertue or worthinesse of the Sacrifice: I advise thee good Reader, thou condemne not the Church for use of the Accident, least so thou lose the fruit of the Substance.

That the people would dispose them selves worthily to receive the blessed Sacrament with the priest at every time he saith Masse, it were to be wished: But that there be no Masse, but when a companie receiveth together with the priest, it is not of commandement by Gods worde. Neither that the people should oftentimes receive, is it of any commandement expressed in scripture, but of devotion, and (in the beginning) of order taken by the Church. And therefore the fathers use not wordes of commandement vnto the people, touching often receiving, but of exhortation, which they would have done otherwise, if to receive oftentimes it had ben commanded in scripture. But as for the priest, he is expressly commanded to consecrate the body and blood of Christ, and therefore to sacrifice, & consequently to receive it. The worde of Christ is this. Do ye this in my remembrance, which the holy Ghost hath taught the Church alwaies so to vnderstande. Sith then the one is of commandement, the other of the peoples devotion only, which in this case stalked, when persecution ceased: let it be wisely considered, whether that, which is necessary by Christs commandement, may be abrogated for lacke of that sometime, which is not of his commandement. If it may not, specially the common practise of the whole Church bring to the contrary: the is Masse where

Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11.

To the Reader.

whereat the Priest receiveth alone, which they cal *Spinate*
Mass. sufficiently anouched.

This being proued, it forceth litle, whether we bring forth
testimonies of y^e first six hundred yeres for it, or no. Testimonies
proue not a thing, onely they report it to haue ben. And yet in
my Answer to his Challenge, I haue alleged mo testimonies of
Antiquitie, then wth reason or learning he hath hitherto auoided.
If he haue a Commission for his owne parte to proue nothing,
but onely to denie, and wangle against our proues: so may he
a long while keepe vs occupied. For moze may one fromward
wangler, be he neuer so ignorant, denie, and demaunde prou-
es for moze in one houre, then many wel learned men shal
wel be hable to anouch and proue in many yeres. It remaineth
he be demaunded to shewe an authentical prohibition, whereby
it may clearly appeare, that the Priest is forbid to consecrate &
offer the Sacrifice, onlesse he haue a number to receiue it with
him forth with in y^e same place. If for this he be hable to shewe
vs neither Scripture, nor example of the primitive Church, nor
Councel, nor Doctour within the first six hundred yeres, nor at
any time els from the Apostles age to this present day, as we are
sure he is not: I trust good Reader thou arte not so farre
wedded to fantasie, as to denie what *St. Jewel* denieth, rather
th^e to helene, what y^e whole Church both w. & w^od^e affirmeth,
and by daily practise to al obedient heleners commended. wher-
as the Scripture assureth vs that the Church is alwaies as-
sisted and lead into al truth by the holy Ghoste, and of *St. Jew.*
it cometh vs no such assurance: every faithful mannes iudgment
herein is sone resolved, vnto whether parte most safely he may
incline.

I. sai. 59.
Mat. 28.
Iohn. 14.



TO M. IEWEL.



Although M. Jewel, when you proclaimed your Challenge at the beginning, you promised to yelde & subscribe, if any man a liue were habile to bring any one sentence out of any olde Doctour, Councel, Scripture, or example of the primitive Church for proufe of any one of al your Articles: yet verely I am perswaded, no wise man beleued, what so euer, or how much so euer were brought, that you would stand vnto your promise. For if your mynde had ben to submit your selfe vnto the contrary iudgment, in consideration of any such sentence by any man to be alleged: You would neuer haue presumed so farre. And by yelding to any point now, were it neuer so assuredly proued, you should seme to confesse the ignorance and errour, in which you remained then: which humble confession agreeth not with the insolent sprite of such craking Chalers. So then the largenesse of your promise, to others maketh the tye of your confidence, and to your selfe the regarde of it increaseth stubbornnesse. wherfore at the first, when I addressed me to answer your Challenge, I doubted not but sone after I should heare of some Replie. As I thought, so it came to passe. The sprite that stirred you to beginne arrogantly, dyueth you to procede desperately. And now that you haue weat your footte, you seme not to care how deepe you wade.

Our lord yet (if it be his pleasure) once open your eyes, and geue you grace to see the danger of the poolc you wade in. Beware by time M. Jewel, you sal not into the horrible gulfe, that Salomon speaketh of. Impius cum in profundum malorum venerit, contemnit. When the wicked man commeth into the bottom of euils, he becommeth careless setting al at nought. I once

To M. Iewel.

Esa. 5.

you fall into this bottom, what hope is there of your recouerie? For whereas none returneth from euil, but he that repenteth him of euil: how can he repent, that hath cast away all care? how can he steppe backe from euil, & be made good, that hath (whose miserable state I say lamenteth) euil is good, and good is euil? How can he see the right way, that maketh darkenes light, and light darkenes? How can he deliue in swete thinges, that taketh sowre for swete, and swete for sowre? You say perhaps, But who be such? The prophete therewith discrieth them saying: woe be vnto you that are wise in your owne sight, and thinke your selues to haue vnderstanding in your owne conceite.

Returne not this scripture vpon me, as your manner is, although although infinitie otherwise oftentimes I offend, & the same to make exchange of euil for good, of light for darkenes, of swete for sowre, swaruing from the squire of Gods laboe, by which I ought to measure the actiōs of my life: yet verely concerning maters of faith and religion, through Gods grace I am cleare free of such peruerse iudgement. For now hauing learned to submit al my knowledge & vnderstanding vnto the iudgement of the Catholike Church, what portion of witt or knowledge so euer is geuen vnto me, I am not wile by mine owne sight, neither thinke I nor my selfe to haue vnderstanding in mine owne conceit. I resigne ouer al, & leane it vnto the iudgement & trial of that Schoole, whereof the spirit of truth is the eneuelling Schoolemaster.

Now because you will not submitte your selfe vnto the Church, but contrarywise condemne the Church because you will iudge, and not be iudged, because you control and refuse the learning of the whole Church of Christe for nine hundred yeres past, & preferre your owne before al others of long time, and iudge of what so euer was said or writtē by any man before this time, according to your private vnderstanding, & not according

To Mr. Iewel.

to the censur of the Church: how can you not seeme to be one of
 the of wdd. & saye mean: wherefore if my holce come to you frō
 to farr of, as be otherwise not longe ynough: yet let y^e warden
 of saye, or rather y^e wordes of God vetered by y^e penne of G.
 saye, sounde in your eares: Woe be ynto you that are wise in
 your owne sight, and thiake your selues to haue vnderstanding
 in your owne conceite.

This mater is wel to be weighed, the case you stand in, is
 deeply to be considered. This much you can not denie. You
 haue for your parte broken the vnitie, that is so much com-
 mended vnto vs in y^e scriptures, & al holy fathers. The Catho-
 like Church (saith S. Cyprian) can be one, it can not be cut and
 diuided, asunder. The Catholike Church alone is the body of
 Christe, saith S. Augustine, whereof he is the head, the Sauour
 of his body. Without this body the holy Ghoste geueth life to
 none. Therfore in an other place he saith, Who so euer is sepa-
 rate from the Catholike Church, how laudably so euer he thinke
 him selfe to liue, for this onely wickednes that he is diuided from
 the vnitie of Christe, he shal not haue life, but the wrath of God
 remaineth vpon him. Tel vs the what is your answer, & where-
 unto you wil stāde. If you remaine not a mēber of y^e Catholike
 Church, the can you haue no life. For as life redoliderth not vnto
 y^e member y^e is cut of from y^e natural body, so neiether geueth the
 holy ghoste life but only vnto such as be mēbers of Chriſtes my-
 stical body. That you are not a member of that body, which we
 esteeme to be the catholike Church, your contrary doctrine, your
 bitter spite & hatred against it, manifestly declarerth. For y^e mem-
 bers of one body agree & lone together, they sal nat out ne sighe
 not one to an other. what resteth the for you to answer, but y^e the
 Church, whose faith we professe, is not y^e catholike church?

If thus you be resoluēd, what nede we heare so long about so
 many your negative Articles? It were a shorter & a plainer way

To M. Iewel.

to conuert al our disputations vnto this issue, that we serched out, where the catholike Church is, and which it is, where it began; and by what succession it hath continued. Merely we acknowledge none other since Christes incarnation, but that which hath continued from the Apostles time by most certaine successions of Bishops vnto this day, and hath spied ouer the whole worlde. Because ye can not shew vs good euidence of such antiquitie, of such order of succession, of so long continuance, of so large spredding ouer the worlde in any of your Congregations, whether they folow the doctrine of Luther, or of Zwinglius, or of Brentius, or of Caluine, or of any other sith Luther beganne: you must heare with vs, if we can iudge neuer a one of them to be Christes Church. Yet if ye wil nedes dispute with vs about the Church, and wil claime that title for your brotherhed of Geneva, which of al other you fauer most: remember how farre ye are already confuted by S. Augustine writing against the Donatistes, who in much like sort as ye do now, contented the Church was quite extincte in al other places of the worlde save Africa, and was to be founde onely among them who took part with Donatus.

But as it is certaine, you wil faile in proufe of your Church of the Caluinistes, so I doubt not, but the worlde ere it be long shal see, how weake are the other partes of your doctrine. A man would thinke who hath heard or read your Challenge, that either you were wel furnished with substantial learning to defende what you took vpon you, or if you were a man of passing impudencie, or of extreme madnesse. Your Challenge was answered you haue replied, what you could do, in this Reple you haue done, what helpe might be had among y whole syde, you haue

To M. Iewel.

not wanted. Schoolemasters, Greke Readers, Lawyers, Canons, Divines, Summisters, Ghost fetchers, Divines of al your sort, & al others that could do ought, haue put to their hands. The whole forces of your side into your booke are brought together. God be thanked for it. Al shal turne to the ioyful victorie of truth, & to the glorie of God, & to your owne confusion at length.

Many thought, ye were invincible: By this it is wel perceived, ye are easy enough to be conquered. Men supposed some great thing to be in you. Now al is sene, what ye haue. And when it shalbe made manifest that ye haue nothing in substance, but onely certaine shewes of thinges: your creaking and boasting shal ende in your contempte and shame.

The event of your vanitie putteth me in remembrance of one Megabytus a great Captain vnder the king of Persie. This Megabytus came on a time vnto the shop of Apelles that most famous painter at Athens. Beholding the Tables, and gruing his verdict of those excellent workes, he praised, and dispaired, liked, and founde faulte, as his fantasie blundered, not as skil directed. Apelles that while standing behind a cloth, and hearing what he said, kepte sory, and spoke thus vnto him. Wither to Megabyte thy purple, golde, and pretious rhaues, and the traine that waiteth on thee, made vs beleue, thou wast a man of great worthinesse: now these hopes here that grinde my colours, hearing thee to speake so foolishly, set nought by thee, and laugh thee to scorn. Wierly though I be not like to Apelles, yet is your case M. Iewel not much unlike to Megabytes.

Heretofore your Rochet, and your square Cappe (for I trowe you be not yet come to be one of the Roundcappe Ministers) your Bishoppske of Sarisburie, your sighely state and condition, your rhetorical perswasions in the pulpite with a holy holding vp of the handes, and raising vp of the eyes to heauen, and with

C 1 your

To M. Jewel.

Your lamentable crying out of your Doo, which you vse very commonly, weening thereby to perswade the simple, your strange asseuerations, your fauour of the common people and others, that clap you on the shoulder, your vaine pulpit huzzing, your Gloria patri at Bowles Crosse: al this hath made many a one beleue, that M. Jewel was a great Clerke, a pillar of the Gospel, a peerlesse felotwe. But now that you haue said al that you, and your whole syde had to saye, now that you haue discovered that lay hidde before, now that your best roare is laid asyde, now that you haue made the worlde witnesse of the proues ye haue for your doctrine: they that haue but meane skill behold a further weaknesse to be on your side, then before they had conceived. Better it had ben for you, ye had mainteyned your opinion and estimation among your owne deceived bycherhed with silence, and with your accustomed creaking, without shewing forth any proues.

Your case shewing as it doth, the Catholikes contemne you; the mere Lutherans laugh at you, so do al others of any what so euer sect late sprung up, and your owne dere brethren the Caluynistes be ashamed of you, as who confesse you gave so large a scope to your Adversarie, in plaine English nolesse to say, then that you had made your Challenge so large, that it could not possibly be defended with any good colour of truth. How little truth you haue for your syde, and how many Untruthes you haue vttered in your Replie, partly by this Accusation, and more largely by the labours of other learned men it is, & shalbe declared.

As concerning your Answer to my peface, it is like the rest of your booke, al together void of truth and plaine dealing. To confute euery parte of it, would require an other booke. Your Untruthes euery where rise so in number, that it is more painful for multitude, then hard for pitch of reason or strength of your para-

To M. Iewel.

to retel your sayings. Here to touch some parte, You pretend, I
mistake & you should so precisely & so openly discover the want
& weaknesse of our side. As M. Iewel, this is as soon denied, as
you affirme it. I could not mistake a thing in you that you never
did. Your vaine Challenge I mistake, that you haue precisely and
openly discovered our want & weaknesse: therein you speake
as verily, as in your Challenge you craue vainly.

You take light occasiō to reuile me with the insufficiency of
my Answer, geuing forth a surmise, as though I complained of
the largenesse of your Offer. How sufficient my Answer is, by
the discussion of your Replie it shal appeare. If the Varruntches
wherewith you charge me, be clearly iustified, and a farre grea-
ter number of Varruntches returned vpon you: my Answer shal
seeme sufficient, your Challenge foolish, your Replie full of gay-
newe to the ignorant, then of substantial piousnes to the learned.
Of your large Offer as at the first I complained not, so now ther-
of I reioyse. For the larger it is, the more shal the arrogancie of
your minde, the falshe of your Gospel, and the weaknesse of
your parte be discovered.

The Denying of your modestie, you haue not scorned away. In-
dede the men, whom I called wise, what so euer you make of the,
would haue concerned better of you, if with such a lawey bragge
you had not made them witness of your folie. Where you say, of
so many Doctors, I am not habile to shewe you one, these be
your wordes of course, wherof contentious mannerers of lyes
must not be sparing. If I shew in dede, then am I able to shew
what I haue shewed, I report me vnto my Answer, and also to
this Mischance for defense of some parte of the same.

That ye looked fiercely, & shoke your sword terribly, I said it
not, as you report me. By the example of cowards, in way of spar-
till, I told you what you did, to shew your couragious hardnes.

To M. Iewel.

From thence to digresse to the odious upbraiding of crueltye, charging vs with the terrour of our sword, with hewing, cutting and sleaing, and with selling our handes with the bloud of our Brethren, it was a matter more spiteful, then to the piersent place pertinent, altogether violently racked to stirre hatred against vs, of it selfe not aptly following. Neither were they our Brethren, vpon whom the Princes lawes were iustly executed, they were reneegates, and Apostates, rebelles against God and man, and forsakers of al true Christian brotherhed.

Naming vs your Adversaries, you say ye cal vs by a civile and a courteous name. How so euer the name ye geue vs liketh you, the dedes ye do vs, please not good men, neither can they seme to vs very civile or courteous. You seme to haue in minde reuenge. Els what meant you so sone againe to charge vs with sworde and fire, and to tel vs, we were embowed with your bloude? wil you beare vs a bloudy harte as Iewel, as you beare Gods truth a peruerse harte? Your Challenge (you say) was not of Ambition, neither your reports of our unhablenesse was of malice. But you were forced thereto by our importunitie, and with great griefe of minde. As for Malice, what measure you haue of it, I leaue to God, who seeth the secretes of al hartes. If you beare vs any, God amend you. If your Challenge proceeded not of Ambition, whereof proceeded it then? God, that seercheth the inward affectes and thoughtes of men, discerneth from whence it proceeded. Soothly we may iudge, that it proceeded not of humilitie. If your harte tel you therin you were ambitious, remember the plague of Coze, Dathan, and Abiron: if, that you were proude, forgette not the fall of Lucifer. Say for your selfe what you wil, to God your meaning is open, to men your doing appeareth vaine.

That you were forced thereto by our importunitie, as you say, who

Num. 16.
Esay. 14.

To M. Iewel.

who do beleue you? For who of vs al troubles you who prou-
ked you? who did so much as put you by the heere? Had ye
not before shute vs by in prisons? Had ye not banished men out
of your way? Was there not greates silence of our parte ouer al
England? Was there any man that openly did so much as disse a-
gainst you? By what importunitie of vs were you then driuen to
blowe vp your trumpet, and make that proclamation? Speake
credibly. M. Iewel, or els the world wil take you for such as
you are. But you tel vs, you were forced with your great grief
of minde. Yea forsooth it was a great griefe to your minde to
see vs al deppressed, and put to silence, your selfe to be exalted to
the Bishoppe of Sarisburie, and set at libertie to crake what
you list. You shal hardly make the world beleue you wept,
onlesse it were for loy.

You finde want of Modestie in me for shewing forth your
boasting. For my part, I pray God I be neuer more found fault
ty for want of Modestie. For excuse of your proude haunting
Solitarie, you pretend to haue anouched the manifest & kno-
wen Truth. Of your manifest and knowne truth you speake
much, and prone lile. It is a thing very vaine, so often to
speake it, and neuer to proue it.

If the truth you meane, were manifest and knowne, why
could not Luther see it, by whose spectacles you haue espied ma-
ny pointes of your Gospel, as otherwhere you affirme? We
acknowledge yett partly the true & real presse of Chyistes body in
blessed Sacrament, which is a greate point, wherein ye varie
from him, and also from the Church. Wm herein follow al
those that profess the Confession of Auspurg, as you knowe.
which are the greater parte of Germanie, and Denmarke. So
that if you wil be tried by the first Founder of your owne
Gospel, you may not say, the truth of you, that be Calumnies,

In Apolo-
gia Eccle-
sie Angli-
cana.

To M. Iewel.

Matthews
Index in
lib. π. 12
You p. 150,
6c.
L. Reg. 13

is manifest and known. Yea he abhorred you the Sacramentaries, and your Communion, and not that onely; but also abhorred to receive any letter that came from your seat.

Because (you say) I have not Dauid's sling in my hand, nor his stones in my scrippe, I am not likely to worke great masteries; neither may I looke that the Ladies of Israel with their Lutes and Timbrelles will receive me in triumph. To this I answer. The working of great masteries I leave to God, by whose power Dauid mastered Goliath. Your Challenge is to baine, and in respect of learning so weak, that to overthrow it, it were no great mastery. Yet neither may you thinke we compared you with Goliath for strength, but only for creaking and bphraiding the whole armie of the Catholique Church. Goliaths wordes were terrible to them of Israel, because they saw his strength was great. The bragge of your wordes scarcely is not, because in dede we knowe your weaknesse.

By Dauid's sling, and his scrippe with stones, what you meane, I knowe not: certainly w the foure weapons, by which you offered this fight to be tried, Scriptures, Auncient Examples, Doctours, and Counsellors, as it were with foure stones taken out of the scrippe of holy Church, and slong at your forehead, you are overthrowen. Speake yet you may, who can let you, but with force rise vp against vs, you can not. Wel may we conquer you with Gods truth, but baine you to hold your noyle we can not. To stay the tongues of Heretiques, it belongeth to him onely, who rebuked Sarhan the Father of Heretiques, saying: Obmutesc, & exi de homine, Hold thy peace and come out of the man.

Mat. 1.
Luc. 4.

For that I, and certaine learned men by sundry treatises, have wrought to the confusion of your Goliathship, we loke not for the praise of Ladies. The looking after such reward we leave to you,

To M. leuel.

to you, whom the hope thereof is sufficient to sustain this wicked trade. But forasmuch as the soules of godly men trieste at our labours, and for the same praise God in vs, such that they may be called Ladies of Israel, for keeping their faith upright and unstained, preuailing with God, as Israel did, in these great temptations and assaults of Schisme and Heresie: there is no doubt, but that they receive vs with their spiritual Lutes and Timbrelles, in ghostly triumph. So they haue toy, and God be praised: it is all the reward that here we looke for.

Your vaine and Ministerlike talke againe the Hope, here I am content to dissemble. Now that you haue imagined him to be Goliath, how ye haue knoe him in y^e forehead, as you crake, let it be iudged by that in of late returned vpon you, by him that wrote a RETVRNE OF VNTRVTHES vpon your Replie, specially where the great and manifest vntuties of your Replie vpon the fourth Article, be to your bitter discredit and shame diligently noted.

But to what purpose is it, to stand long in ripping vp your Answer to my Preface? You start from place to place, and seriously plowing nothing, you fill your paper with much matter impertinent, neither in my Preface touched, & already for the more parte confuted, euerie where shewing forth your spite against the Church of Christ, and the Catholike Religion. You are much beholden to certaine Canonistes, and to the Glose vpon the Canon law. For out from thence you stole your self with much gay stuffe against y^e Hope. But how false & forged stuffe it is, wrested from the writers meaning, it selfe also being of small authoritie: surer man that conferreth the places, may easily espye.

You make much a doo about your Negative, and beare the world in hande, you may lawfully and reasonably stand vpon y^e Negative, in denying so many points of our faith and religion,

To M. leuel.

Gregor.
lib. 4. epist
32.

August.
epist. 165.

because S. Gregorie used a negative proposition writing to Iohn the Bishoppe of Constantinople, who ambitiously usurped the title of vniuersal Bishop. What though S. Gregorie said by way of a negative: No Bishop of Rome euer tooke vnto him this name of singularitie? Againe what though S. Augustine (for him also you allege) hauing reckened vp al the Bishops of Rome before his time, said by a negative: In this order of succession there is found no Bishop, that was a Donatist? What though I would say, as I might truly say, Of y^e whole number of them that haue ben Bishops of Sarisburie before this time: among them al there can none be found, that was a Calvinist? Likewise y^e of al the Bishops that euer were in England, none was married before Cranmure? Because these thinges he said by a Negative in defence of truth, that it therefore be lausful for you to utter your heresies and slanderous doctrine by a Negative to impugne the truth? As for example, that it therefore be lausful for you to say, that for the space of six hundred yeares after Christe, the people were neuer taught to beleue, that Christes body is really present in the Sacramente? That no Priest had authoritie to offer vp Christe vnto God the Father? That the body of Christe can not be in more places then one at one time? To reherse the rest it is needlesse.

Upon this Negative it liketh you wel to dally, and because it offendeth vs so much of your side (for so you say) of your liberalitie you wil turne it of our side. When you pretend to turne it so as it might like vs best, and as we would haue you say. And when you haue made al your turninges, you doe as much for vs, as if ye gaue vs a Snake for an Adder. This your Negative say you, we can not reppone: Our Affirmative can not be proued. Your doctrine is manifest and knowne Truth: we dectine the people with errors: and the Church hath erred these nyne hundred

To M. lewel.

hundred yerres: And we haue haue nothing to say for vs. Thus you say & say againe. And whereas you proue nothing, but your selfe a great lyer: yet you thinke good to set out y^e matter with bolde and impudent affirmations. what piouses we haue, and how iustly we confute your objections and Replies, let our Treatises be examined.

You repoite my wordes vntreuly, as your common manneer is, making your reader beleue, as though I said, al your Articles were of light importance. As sir, I neither said it, nor thought it. Some of them are of right great importance, y^e more basynous is your wickednesse: And y^e lightest of them is of weight ynough to drawe you downe to the rueful state of damned soules, if for maintenance of your pynate opinion touching the same, ye seare not to breake the vnitie of the Church. Yet as though I had said, what you falsely repoite me to say, you procede, and scoffingly demaunde, whether ye may thinke that our Religion increaseth and vadeth, waxeth and waneth, as doth the Moone. If such gall be vttered, when no occasion is geuen, what venime may we looke for to be spitte forth, if by ouersight some peece of occasion be ministred vnto spite?

Concerning the rest of your Answer, wherin you treat certain common places, and utter much spite against the Pope, falsly bearing the worlde in hande, that he chalengerh vnto him the title of vniuersal Bishop, and that he suffereth him selfe openly to be proclaimed by the name of God: wherein also you lay forth your common stuffe against the Canon of the Masse, against Transubstantiation, against Inuocation of Saintes, against Aulcers, &c. (prayer for the dead ye condemne, though wisely without shewing cause why, for none ye haue to shewe) why answer ye not the booke made in
so reffill euery one of these, it would require a longer treatise,

To M. Iewel.

defence of
Dargas
topp,
where
paper for
the dead is
avouched
and pro-
ved

then the nature of an Epistle, or discourse will permitte, I thinke
good therfore to let passe and contemne many thinges, that may
apperteyne to others as wel as to me, and which you would
haue said to any other man, that had by writing controlled your
temeritie. And to come to answer that, which concerneth my
person specially:

You haue picked out, or set some a worke to pick out for you,
and haue laid together al the termes and wordes vsed in my
booke, which a good man may iustly bestow in rebuke of vice
vpon euil mē, with which neuerthelesse the euil men be grieved.
Those wordes be these, Thermites, Goliath, Beathens, Publi-
cans, Sacramentaries, Lucians, Scoffers, Rascals, Presumptuous,
Ignorant, Deemish, and certaine other like. At the same you
kicke and spurne, as if they had ben meant of your owne person,
or of your owne brethren of Geneva only, and not of any he-
retikes enemies of Gods truth in general. why M. Iewel
is your owne gaide backe. so sope, that if I reach forth my hande
to touch an others, that is in like case, you can not say your
selfe from wincing? And that it may appeare how farre I haue
offended herrin, let the mater be wel considered, I pray you.

Thermites.

Thermites is accompted of Homer the sondest of al the Grecians
that came to Troie, because he boasted much him selfe, and
twined other men of dastardnesse. By your arrogant Challenge
made to al the learned men a liue (for those wordes be blown
forth by the trumpet of your proclamation) do you not make
your selfe a vaine braggar, and to esteeme al other men for vn-
learned? May we not liken such a gentilsman to Thermites?

Goliath.

1 Reg. 17.

Goliath offered to fight but man for man with any one of
Israel, you prouoke al men a liue to campe with you. And
shal we not compare you with Goliath? Wretched such a one
pauity

To M. Jewel.

gallies, he persecuted, he persecuted Goliath.

Christ saith in the Gospel, If one will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee, as a heathen and a publican. **M. Jewel** doth not only not hear the Church, but he resisteth the Church, he impugneth the Church, he fighteth with all his power against the Church. And may we not be so bolde as to say, we make no more account of him, then of an Heathen or a Publican?

They that denie the body of Christe to be really present in the Sacrament, by the common report of the worlde, by Luther him selfe, and by them of Luthers schoole, be named Sacramentaries: and must **M. Jewel** alone be borne with al, and no man be so hardy, as to cal him a Sacramentarie, who most blasphemously both in his writings and also preachings in-vengeth against the truth of the Real presence?

There was neuer any Dickensones, that teased more pleasantly at any tyme in an Entertide, then **M. Jewel** scoffeth blasphemously at the most holy and dreadfull Mysteries. And may no man be so hardy as to name him a Lucian, or a Scotus?

What maner man ever overshotte him selfe so farre, as to make such a halcy Challenge, specially in matters of Religion by so long practice of the Church determined: who ever presumed so to make defiance as it were to all learned men, yea to all men alive: who ever defended a matter so stoutly anonched, with lesse learning: who ever in so weighty pointes made Argumentes of lesse pitch, so light, and so childish: And yet this holy fellow standeth so high in his owne conceit, that whiles he laith about him, singeth, and cryeth at all men, spareth not the reuerence of his Mother, no nor the Maestie of the holy Ghost, and Christe our Roy: he

Heathen
and Pub-
lican.

Mat. 23.
Luce. 11.

Sacra-
mentaries.

Lucian.

Math,
presump-
tuos, &c.

To M. Iewel.

may not be touched, so much as it were with a venue of these most deserved termes, Rash, Presumptuous, Ignorant, Beuish. It were ouer long to prosecute the rest, for vse and application whereof, it is easy to render a due and iust reason.

Vetus Comædia.

You would haue men thinke, this were Vetus Comædia. As M. Iewel, it is Zelus Dei, it is not Vetus Comædia. The imitation of Vetus Comædia hath euer ben taken for a badge of men of your profession. It is not like the olde heathenish libertie of railing, it is the Zeale of God, and seruour of spirit, such as we finde to haue ben in the Prophetes, in the Apostles, in Christe him selfe. Ye mocke and scosse not only at our persons, as the naughty boyes of Bethel did at Elizeus, but at our auncient Religion, and at the Church of Christe. Yet we curse you not in the name of our Lorde, as he did those euil nourtered children, that ye might be toren of beares. Yet were it better for you to be toren and deuoured of beares, then thus to teare and deuoure so many Christian soules, as ye doo. with your wicked doctrine you haue so brought the people from God, as now for a great number, they may seme not to halt on both sides, but to be falle downe right. Yet do we not cal for fire to descend from heauen and burne you vp, neither do we stirre the people to take you, and destroye you, as Elias bad the people so destroye the false Prophetes.

4. Reg. 1.

3. Reg. 13.

Philip 3.

August.

De vitiis

te creden-

Certaine false preachers for their great impudencie, and for that they barked at the light of the Gospel, as dogges do at the Moone by night, S. Iuanle called dogges, and bad the Philippians to beware of them. Your preaching is as impudent, and dangerous as theirs was, ye neuer sinit barking at the Church (beate with the terme Sainct Augustine bleth it against such as ye are) and at the holy Catholike Religion, naming

To M. Iewel.

naming it Bapistris, Ignorance, Superstition, and Idolatrie: *di ad Ho*
Yet we spare your worshipps, and put you in minde of your out- *ROYAL MAJ.*
rage with moze courteous language.

Jeremie calleth them of Jewrie Staliens, for that they neyed
each one at an others wife. Ezechiel calleth the false Prophetes of *Jerem. 5.*
Israel, Foxes, so Christe him selfe named Herode, a foxe. Your *Ezech. 13.*
companions buchaft life, and lecherous neyng at their strum-
pettes couered with the false cloke of Mariage, what godly hart
doth not abhoire? Your spiteful guyles, and wyles, with
which ye entrappe men, whom true deuotion, and vertuous li-
uing declareth to be Catholike, who seclerth not, and smarteth?
Yet haue we not chaffened your lewdnesse, and false dealing with
such reuiling wordes.

As for my selfe, how so euer it please you to charge me with Ve-
tus Comedia, verely I seme to men of right good discretion, ra-
ther to offende in lenitie and softenes: and many do wish I had
tempered the Iyncke wherewith I wrote my Answer, with shar-
per ingredience then I haue. Albeit I sought not to please the
honours of men, but rather to serue the wil of God, & as I might,
to defend the truth, and discharge my conscience. wherein touching
the order of my stile, I thought good, to doo rather what became
the cause, then what belonged to your deserte.

But with what face could you M. Iewel reprove me for
the vse of wordes, that might offend? Is it not reason, who bla-
meth an other, that in the thing he blameth, he be not founde
faultry him selfe? A man would thinke to finde you softe and
sweete, & thus haue rebuked me for being rough and sowre. But
whoso euer wil come neare you & feele you, & pluck of your frui-
tes, & taste of the: shal soone perceiue what a picking vchin you
are, & what Crabbes you beare. Verely of al writers & I haue
read, I neuer soude any, & vseth the lothly manner of scoffing & mo-
king, so much as you do, when reason faileth, a scoffe is at hande.

CC ii when

To M. Iewel.

when an argument pressed, a mocke served for answer. when
the matter goeth plaine on the contrary side. then Dicksoner
bestireth him, and with teasing pulleth away the minde of the
reader to an other light thought: that so al might be laughed out,
and the chiefe point let passe.

1720
1721

In olde time Philosophers had names given them of some
special propertie and disposition of minde. Socrates was
named the* dissembler, Plato the Divine, Heraclitus, P. Parke,
Carnades the Subtile, Chrysippus, the Sharpe, Theophras-
tus, the Sweete, Diogenes the Doggish. Certainly had you
ben alive at those dayes, you had ben named, Jewel the Scoffer.
Yet for your learning I weene you had, not ben annimbered a-
mong Philosophers. Because I knewe of olde that scoffing
wiste of yours, in answering to your Challenge, I tempered
my stile so, both as the matter required, and as I might seme to
gentle you no occasion in replying to runne out from the purpose,
and to follow your peculiar scoffing daime. And how so ever you
have laid forth in one heape, the wordes which you seme to
charge me with, to be sene al aronce: Yet whosoever tradeth my
booke, and marketh it wel: shal see, that I applie not the most
parte of them vnto your person, nor vnto your felowes particu-
larly, but vnto Heretikes in general. with which order of writing
no good man ought to be grieved. This not withstanding, how
little you have withdrawn your selfe from your euill disposition,
& fro your olde wante of scornning & scoffing, your Replie hath at-
tull declared. In dede whosoever required you to leave y grace,
required your losse. For let that once be take from you, and you
remaine very much disgraced. Yea were it so that the use of scold-
ing and craking, and libertie of lying were utterly denied you
(lying I meane every way, for in you it is of sundry sortes) then
were you left very naked.

But

To M. Jewel.

But M. Jewel, perge mentiri, (you know who saith it) ye out least as me, mocke, raille, scoffe and scorne at me; while you satisfie your selfe, I shal not onely not be grieved therewith, but contrarie wille by Gods grace, feele therein a greas comfort, and inward ioye. If ye seeke to be reuenged on me for that I haue ben so bolde, as to answer your vaine Challenge; and by this Reioynde to confute parte of your colourable Replye: either holde your peace, or speake so as you be not founde a lyer, if ye can. for truly by your euil speaking of me, you shal but increase the heape of my felicitie. Standing vpon a good grounde, as thereof I am assured, I shal vjstwe the wordes of Christe vnto my speciall comforte, who saith, Blessed are ye when men reuile you, and persecute you, and say al manner of euil sayinges against you for my sake. Reioyse and be glad, for great is your rewarde in heauē. For so persecuted they the Prophets, which were before you.

Matth. 5.

Neither can you say this saying is common, and serueth you no lesse then me. The case of vs both is not like pardy. I say my selfe vpon the Church, the pillar and sure stay of truth, as the blessed Apostle saith, and also vpon the Scriptures expounded by the Church. You be departed from the Church, & wander ye wote not whither, nor where to set sure footing. You impugn the Church. It is my power defend the Church, against which hel gates shal not preuaile. You folow Luther, Zuinglius, Peter Martyr, Caluine, and Beza, men by sundry euidences knowen to be void of the spiritte of God: I folow and honour the Catholike Church, with which I am assured the holy Ghoste the Spiritte of truth by Christe is promised to remaine for euer.

1. Tim. 3.

Matth. 16.

Iohn. 14.

Esai. 59.

Now I come vnto your other point, wherewith as with a most painous crime, you charge me, which is my departing fro your gospel as you say, This you object bitterly vnto me, not sly

To M. leuel.

in your Answer to my Preface, but also in very many places of your Reply, and specially in your Conclusion. You chide by olde rehearsal of it, both to grieve me, and somewhat to discredit me, hoping so to bring prejudice unto the cause, which I defende. In your Conclusion you spread abroad your winges as it were, and take your full flight at me. There you say, that of my person, as you promised, you wil say nothing. But how I may trust to your promise, as wel by this, as by your other dealing, you geue me to vnderstand. For there you say of me the worst you can, and more then you ought, and more then is true, and much lesse then you would say, in case you knew other evils by me. That you might haue the better oportunitie to utter your spite, by a fiction you make a simple man to tel me your tale for you.

Vnder the vizard of your Simple man, you say, that not long since I taught them of your side the Gospel, euen in like sorte and forme in all respectes, as it is taught now, for euen so be your very wordes. You remember (you say) my wordes, the manner, and courage of my utterance. You remember, I told you of the Paper vualles, and painted Fiers of Purgatorie, that Rome was the Smicke of Sodome, that the Masse was a heape of Idolatrie, and the Mysterie of iniquitie, and, I can not tel what. Thus you say, I taught them the Gospel, whereby you do vs to weete, what ye meane by your Gospel, and wherein it consisteth. And this you remember, you say, whereby it appeareth you haue a maruelous memorie. For if you can remember thinges, that were neuer said nor donne: what wil you not remember, that hath ben said or donne?

To answer to the matter simply and truly, as before God, I wil not here for my better excuse, accuse the will of the Prince, in whose dayes I was brought vp in learning, the earnest endenour of the Gouernours then being so laiclike his desires, the cruelty of the lawes, the preluding

To M. Iewel.

being both in general excepts a very few, the great silence of
preachers: that then durst not teach necessities, the common
ignorance of men. Omitting all these, which I might bring for
some part of excuse, I am content for Truths sake freely to ac-
cuse my selfe. In certaine pointes I was deceived (I confesse)
by Caluist, Melancthon, and a few others, as you by them
and sundry others are now deceived in many.

In confessing this much, I remember the grane aduise ge-
uen by *Augustine* in the like case. *Qui primas non potuit sa-
pientie, secundas habeat partes modestie: vt qui non valuit omnia
impenitenda dicere, saltem poeniteat, quæ cognouerit dicenda
non fuisse.* who could not haue the first partes of wisdom,
let him haue the second partes of modestie: that whereas he was
not able to say all thinges so, as thereof a man should not repent
him, at least let him repent him of those thinges, which he kno-
wed should not haue ben said. If any man thinke for my esti-
mations sake, I should not so farre abase my selfe, as to confesse
mine owne error: take he it, as he wil, verely it behoued me to
consider of that sentence of the Apostle, where he saith, *Si nos ipsos* 1. Cor. 11
iudicemus, a Domino non iudicabimur, If we iudged our sel-
ues, we should not be iudged of our Lord.

Now as to confesse this much, truth requireth, so to ac-
knowledge your false reportes, wisdom forbiddeth. Whem
would I also not let to confesse, if I with God were belied with
out lyes. where then you say, I taught your Gospel euen in like
sorte and forme in all respectes, as it is taught now: that I denie ve-
terly. In dede I hadde and coued somtimes, but your wickes
I neuer tooke to be so farre frome to shooe at. Neither truely
could I see the Marke, that you say. Iewel, and such as you are,
shooe at, it was so farre of. And therefore I stood out, and shotte
smaller game: whereat as my winning was less, so my losse also

*August.
lib. 1. re-
tract. in
prologo.*

T. M. Jewel.

(I thank God) was lesse daſgetous. And as your ſermons were far without my reach, ſo neither had I very great ſkill of *ſort and ſerue*, which you your ſelfe now uſe in this kinde of ſhooting.

As for your *Reſpectes*, to ſay truſly, I neuer knewe what they were. At the gaminge of your Goſpel, you ſhoot to ſtrike downe the true and real body of Chriſte out of the bleſſed Sacrament of the Aulter, with certaine Phyaſes of ſpeech, with telling the people of your tropes and figures, with comparing the Eucharift to Baptiſme, with making the preſente of Chriſt live in both. You bende your force, to ſtrike away the eternal and

In the 5. Article.

In the 17. Article, & other where. In the Reple.

a pag. 72

b. pag. 40.

c. pag. 7.

d. pag. 623.

e. pag. 69.

ſingular Sacrifice of the Church, with ſuch a *ſort and ſerue*, as I hitherto neuer ſled, and yet thinke to be very ſtrange. As for example, with teaching as you doo, that a *Maſſe* ſignifieth not the *Maſſe*, but your Communion. That a *Euchariftia* is to be taken not for the Sacrament conſecrate, but for comon Bread wherewith one Biſhop did preſent an other. That *Michiſedech*, and *Malachias*, ſignified the Sacrifice of your Communion, wherewith the people liſte up their handes, and haries (as you ſay) unto heauen, prayeth and ſacrificeth together, rejoycing in the Lorde. That in the Sacrament of the Aulter, there is no vertue ne grace, but when it is uſed, nomore then in water after yone is baptized. That there is no difference betwixt the Prielt and the people in the holy Miniſterie of the Sacrifice, and that Laie folke men and women do make the Sacrifice, and be Prieltes after the order of *Michiſedech*, that God is the author of evil, and diuerſeth men to ſinne. Many other ſuch *ſortes and ſerues* of ſhooting you and your companions uſe at this day, with which I was neuer acquainted, as neither any man living can burthen me, and God is witneſſe, with to me is a ſufficient diſcharge. wherefore you do me the greater wrong, in that you ſay I taught your Goſpel, *even in like ſorte, and ſerue, and in like ſort as it is taught here.*

To M. N. Del.

Touching the other pointes of your Gospel, which you
 speake of, haile so euer I speake once at Oxford or Cambridge, and
 at an other time at the Masse, otherwise then now by Gods
 grace, a study of more mature yeares I haue ben instructed: yet
 that at any time I tolde you of the Paper vyalles, and painted fiery of
 Purgatorie, and that the Masse was a heape of Idolatrie, and the My-
 sterie of Iniquitie: it is altogether false. Those counterfeit like re-
 mainer Paper vyalles, and painted Fiery, in good sooth I remember
 and that euer I heard before your booke came forth. Neither
 in the Masse speake I at any time so blasphemously, as you repute
 me. For in despite of Rome, euer entered I into such filthy
 talke, nor liked them, when I liked your Gospel best: that in
 their pulpites, emptied their gorge of such stinking matter. In
 the for that yere and halfe, in which onely now and then I oc-
 cupied a Preachers place, and that by enforcement: of Rome, of
 the hope, of Abuses, of things which then I thought to be a
 misse, of Ceremonies, and of certaine other pointes, being sedu-
 ced by some of them that now seduce you, I talked otherwise,
 then (as now I iudge) was convenient. And to say the truth,
 he that would not talke of such thinges at that time, how could
 he haue ben permitted in thispise to talke at al? And because in
 small places I spent the time with other maters, then either with
 these, or with such as they of your side were then desirous to
 heare, as it is wel known: they obtained a better hope of mee,
 then presently they saw any great thing, that to their iudgement
 seemed to be liked in me.

What I should haue done, and how farre I should haue
 gone, in case Gods providence had not changed my Rates he saw,
 in whom nothing is vnlesse. And perhaps in continuance of time,
 I should haue toynd further to you, except his speciall grace had
 called me backe, and fettered me from you. What to euer in those
 dayes I thought of, said amaine, our Lorde togeare and togeare.

To M. leuel

Aug. ad
Vincentiū,
epist. 48.

Very like it is, had not the condition of that time been altered,
that I should have thought it was worse then I did, & have been
carried away further. But now I see what great cause I have
to reioice and thanke God, who vsed the change of the time, as
an occasion and meanes, whereby to chaunge me into the better,
For, whyles I feared to suffer that I would not, by new condition
of the time, I was compelled to seeke the Truth, which be-
foze I knew not, and willingly to holde that, which before I
refused. And so now I may seeme to be of the number
of them, to whom Saint Augustine in the like case maketh
thus to speake. Nesciebamus hic esse veritatem, nec eam disce-
re volebamus, sed nos ad eam cognoscendam metus fecit attentos,
quo timuimus ne forte sine vllis rerum eternarum lucris damno
rerum temporalium fetiremur: Gratias Domino, qui negligenti-
am nostram stimulo terroris excussit, vt saltem solliciti quære-
mus, quod securi nunquam nosse curauimus. We knewe not
that the Truth was here (in the Catholike Church) neither had
we wil to learne it, but feare made vs attent to know it, wher-
with we feared, least perhaps without any gaine of everlasting
things, we should be stricken with the losse of temporal things:
Our Lorde be thanked, who hath vsuen away our negligence
with the piques of terrour, that at least we should carefully seeke
that, which being without al feare, we neuer tooke care to know.
Yet if I were so earnest & so vehement a Gospeller, as now to
discredite me you say I was, why did I freely and without al
compassion geue ouer the Kinges Hebrew lesson, which was
so good and so quiet a liuing, that I might not depart from that
Catholike Colledge, in which I was brought up, vnto Christi-
church in Oxford, where I freest Gospellers were then placed:
If I were such as you make me, how happed it, I got so little
fauour and preferment among the Prelates of your side: which
of

To M. Iewel

Of them al did ought for me: Yea among the meaner sorte, who
 of this friendship, or any inward acquaintance with me: wish
 which of them was I great: May who was there of them, that
 did not loth mee for suspicion of papists (as you call it) because
 they had me diagee, and come nothing nigh the Gole, which
 they came vnto: were not the two Sermons which I made
 at Saintes Crosse, very much finished, because in the one I
 spake much for Charitie and good workes, and against the Sla-
 ues puffed wallowing in their fleshly exercises, in the other of
 the great abuse of Gods worde, threatening that for euill life it
 should be taken from them, and be geuen to others that would
 perforce it, and liue according vnto it: Remember you not how
 not long before King Edwardes death, Bradford, a your friend
 that was the distributour of the Merchantes exhibition at Ox-
 ford to the reliefe of such scholars as would frame them selues to
 your Gospel (you know whom I meane) once bitterly refused
 an exhortation to be uttered to the Students, which with some
 difficultie they had caused me to draw forth in writing, myning
 it should in manner of a Sermon openly haue pronounced it, if
 they had liked it: The Theme I tooke for that purpose (if you
 remember) was the saying of S. Paule to Timothee, Attendetibi
 & doctrine. Take heede vnto thy selfe and vnto learning. Did I
 not there exhort a Student to take heede first vnto him selfe,
 and then to the learning which he laboured to attaine, that they
 thought good, after they had heard me read it, to take heede of
 me, and of my learning, rather then to suffer myne exhortation
 touching so little toward your Gospel, to be pronounced: was
 not I then finished, as one not forwarde enough for that pur-
 pose, and therfore dispatched of al, and therwith Sampson re-
 quired to geue him vp into the pulpite: If you were not present
 when myne exhortation was read, demanding of the said mer-
 chant

1. Tim. 4.

changes factour (in he can finde in his hart) to tel you the truth

you may learne this much to be true.

What shall I speake of the sundry compasses and desires
which they of your Iste used to bring me in; that I might be
made a better Gospeller? What wayes and meanes did my
better faculty practise with me after my returne from beyond
the sea, to perswade me thereto? To how many private con-
ferences was I called, which in his house he made in the Italian
congrue, to Sabadie Catarine the Romaine of Genoa in Lorraine
his present wife, to Synelle the Italian, to Flandre the
Spaniard, to Iulio his man, and to me: For al this I remem-
bered as before: and you know to what end. It wel no man better, how far
I was from his inward familiaritie whereunto you were ad-
mitted, and what strangenesse there continued alwaies betwix
him and me. I wil not say by whom, and how earnestly I was
moued to become King Edwardes Chaplein, which was a de-
uise to set me further forward. Neither wil I here declare
the secret practises, and large offers, with which the Bishops of
your Gospell intiled me to come on lustily, and to hasten me vnto
the perfection in al respects, which you be arrived vnto.

You shal be wel to beare the woyle in hart no more, that
I was so great a Gospeller, least whyles you seeke to discredit
me, you proue your selfe worthy of this credit. What in some
pointes I was deceived with the common error of the time, I
confesse, and am right sorry for it. But how farre I proceeded in
error, and how neare vnto my harte I lost the loue of it, whe-
ther I maintained it for any other purpose, then that for the sake
I knewe none other truth, whether I embraced it with a simple
or a double heart, whether it grew in me from my youth by
accoustance, and continued through the same, or was affixed af-
terward through ambition, and maintained by malice: because here-
of

To M. Iewel

of it is not your part to iudge, it shalbe best for you to leane al to
Gods iudgement, who seeth the secretes of al hartes.

If I may be belieued telling that of my selfe, which I mis-
take and God know best: this is the truth. My errour was of
ignorance, not of malice. My understanding was obscured, my
will was not of selfe purpose perverted. wherein I offended, it
was not so much through malice of wil, as through want of skill.
I did not with animositie, as S. Augustine calleth it, mainteine
what liked my private choise, but ignorantly I receined, what
griuously the condition of the time obtruded. Though at the
time when I made sute to our Loyde, I had conceived an vniuersal
opinion, though in knocking for him, I missed of the right way,
though in seeking him I streies out of the way into a bye-path:
yet because moued by his special graces I made sute and petition
vnto him, because I knockte, because I sought him without a
my speake of a malicious wil: it hath pleased his great mercie,
to graunt my petition, to open vnto me, and to be founde of me.
I trust I may truly and without offence of God say, that S. Cy-
prius reported to haue ben said by Maximus, Urbanus, Sydonius
and certaine other godly men, who had likewise ben deceived by
Nouatianus the heretike. Nos errorem nostrum confitemur. Cir-
cumuenti sumus perfidie loquacitate factiosa amentes: Videba-
mur quasi quandam communicationem cum schismatico homine
habuisse. Syncera tamen mens nostra semper in Ecclesia fuit. We
repent our errour. We were begyled as men beside our selues
by the busy babling of falshood. We seemed as it were to haue so-
med with a schismaticke. Yet was our minde (that is to say our
harte wil and intent) alwayes pure in the Church.

That I proceeded no farther in errour, it was the goodness of
God, who with his merciful hand staid me backe, from running
to the extreme, that you be saued vnto, may be iustified

Math. 7.

Cyprian.
lib. 3. epist.
11. ad Cor-
nel.

To M. Jewel.

me to procede so farre, whether it were by the remembrance of such
a fall to worke in me a more perfite humilitie, or to the intent I
should thus be made for time to come the more steadfast & constant
considering the danger I was in, or by my example to provoke
others to forsake their errors and heresies, & to returne vnto
vntie of the Catholique Church, or thereby to moue my harte
both to pitie those that are deceived, and for some recompense to
write against the errors of this time: al this I leane vnto
his secreete wisdom, which as the wise man saith, Reacheth
from ende to ende mightily, and disposeth al thinges sweetly, or
(as the Greeke text readeth) *profitably. Now say you what
you wil, thus I am, and thus by Gods grace, wil I remaine
to the ende.

Xp̄ys

In the
answer to
my pie-
face.

In the
answer, &
in the con-
clusion.

Ambros.
lib. 2. in
Incarn.

Leo ser. 1.
de pente-
coste.

You seme to marvel how I became so perfite a Catholike
in so shorpe a time. As you say, I preached the contrary many
yeres (wherein you say vntuly, for neither preached I ful two
yeres, and that not many Sermons, neither was I priest before
Queene Maries time): so you pretend it to be an impossible thing,
that in seven dayes (for of that time you speake more then once)
I should read ouer al the Scriptures, Councels, and Doctours:
as though a man by Gods special grace, could not be turned fro
errour to truth, whose harte was not stubbornly set to mainteine
a parte, nor yet drowned in many errors, onlesse he first read
ouer al bookes of Diuinitie. What meane you M. Jewel, wil
you appoint God a tracte of time to worke in, when he toucheth
the harte of man? S. Ambrose could hane taught you to iudge
otherwise, where he saith, Nescit tarda molimina sancti spiritus
gratia. The grace of the holy Ghost goeth not slowly to worke,
when it goeth about good enterpises. And S. Leo, O quam
velox est sermo sapientie, & vbi Deus Magister est, quam cito dis-
citur, quod docetur? O how swifte is the worde of wisdom,
saith

To M. Iewel.

saith he; and where God is schoolemaster, how soone is it learned, that is taught? when Elieus was called fro the plough, when S. Paul was striken down in the way, when S. Martho was commaunded to come from his counting house to folow Christe, when the other Apostles were called from their nettes: wil you marvel, they obeyed forthwith, before they had read ouer the Law, the psalmes, the prophetes, and the other bookes of the olde Testament? Standeth the matter necessarily in reading ouer many and great bookes?

Reg. 19.
Act. 9.
Mat. 9.
Mat. 4.

And why do you charge me with the suddaine change of former dayes? was it not one whole yeare after king Edwardes death, before I came in pulpit? And then did I not of myne owne accord, without al compulsion or request of others, simply and fully acknowledge and confesse my former oversight and error? was not al the Vniuersitie of Wycombe witness hereof? O M. Iewel, I doubt not but by that my voluntary and humble confession, I haue put the Deuil to silence, through the same he shal not haue power to object vnto me mine error before Christe our Judge in that dreadfull day. You I can not put to silence, your tongue and penne I can not stae. Woth not your malice then seeme to passe the malice of the Deuil? wel, say on here against me what you list, there litle shal you haue to say. I perceiue the saying of S. Cyprian to be true, Non possunt laudare nos qui recedunt a nobis. They can not speake wel of vs, that depart from vs. Our Loyde who can raise vp sonnes to Abraham out of stones, soften your stony harte, and open your blinded vnderstanding, to see the perils and treful state that you stand in.

Cyprian.
Antonia-
no fratri.
lib. 4.
Epist. 2.
Mat. 3.

But what meant you M. Iewel of al men, thus vncourteously, and withal very falsly to deale with me? You might much better haue vttered this spite against me by meane of some

To M. Iewel.

M. Iewel's
subscription
at Oxford

of your frendes, or Ministers, one or other, then in your owne person. Now you haue geuen euident witnesse to the worlde, that you are not only spiteful and malicious, but also impudent and foolish. For who be you good Syr, that thus vpbraid me with the reproch of inconstancie? Are not you one M. Iohn Iewel that in S. Maries Church at Oxford, subscribed openly, befoze the whole Vniuersitie to the Articles by the Catholiques mainteined, by the Gospellers impugned, after the Disputations there kept by learned men of both Vniuersities against Crammar, Ridley, and Latimer, whereat you were present, and did the office of a Notarie, to repozte in wryting, al that was there done and said, and after that you had heard the uttermost what could be said of your side? Subscribed you not to these Articles, That Chyistes true and natural body and blood are verely and really present in the Sacrament of the Altar vnder the formes of bread and wine? That the Masse is a Sacrifice propitiatorie for the quicke and dead? and to diuerse other Articles, which now you impugne?

Sith you did this, as you can not denie it, what impudencie is it, to charge me as you do? Yea what foolishnes is it? For inasmuch as your whole tale may iustly be returned vpon you, by this you haue much discredited both your self, and your learning in the iudgement of any reasonable man. You should haue been cleare your selfe, befoze you had thus vnto the worlde accused mee.

If I would compare both our doings together, and with plaine truth at large set foze the oddes that is betweene them, when should I make an ende? Only this much your selfe may consider. whereas both we went from that befoze we held, you by Subscription of your owne hande, I by voluntarie Confessions

To M. Iewel.

tion: sith you afterwarde fledde away, and returned to that you renounced, & I remained, and stil continue in that whereto with good advise I have comended my self: who seeth not, whether of vs both is either the more inconstant man, or the greater dissembler? what thought you when you subscribed, that you did wel, or otherwise? If wel, how were you so sone changed. I wil not say in seven daies, but soothly in very fewe dayes in respect of so great a matter? If you thought you did euil, and yet wittingly woulde do it: then were you an euil man, yea a wicked man, a godlesse dissembler, a false lyer vnto the holy Ghost, a presumptuous tempter of God. Remember you not the example of Ananias and Sapphira his wife? were you not afraid of Gods like iudgement to be exercised vpon you; and of his vengeance to light vpon you for the like wickednesse, and lying vnto the holy Ghost? Answer to whether parte you list, you are taken and holden fast.

Act. 5.

You do ascribe my change to the change of the Prince. I marvel you be so wel cyped in my doings, and so blind in your owne. what was it I pray you, that made you so suddainely to change, and to subscribe? was it not the change of the Prince? Had the other yong Prince liued, would you haue subscribed to the Real Presence, to the Masse, to the Propitiatorie Sacrifice, and to the rest of the Articles, which now you denie? I thinke your selfe wil say nay.

Wel, then we see, the change of a Prince may bring you also to a change. what if God so dispose, that now also the harts of the Prince, detecting the lewdnesse of their lines who professe your Gospel, and seeing the vntruth of your doctrine, & lamenting this vniversal decay of vertue proceeding thereof, and

To M. leuel.

the better damnation of so many soules : be wholly bent to restore
the Catholique Religion of the Church, and abandon al these
wicked new diuises of Geneva : what wil you then do : wil
you subscribe once againe, or wil you not : Merely what you
wil do, God knoweth. But your soper actes be such, as I
trow any wiseman wil hardly trust you.

How changeable your faith is according to the change
of every Prince, to al them that euer knew you, it is not vnknown.
what King Henry would to be changed, folowed not
you the same? when he called backe with the lawe of the five
Articles, such as to him seemed to runne forwarde ouer hastily,
did you not retire, as it were, when his Trumpet blew the re-
trait? In King Edwardes daies, daunced you not after the
pipe of that time? when Quene Marie came to the Crowne,
did you not frame your selfe to be a conformatable man to the Re-
ligion of that state in euery respect, and at length did you not
subscribe as readily as any other man in the whole Vniuersitie?
But after your Brethren had schooled you, did you not turne
again making a relapse? And because you coude not abide
their looks remaining in that, whereunto you had subscribed,
did you not flee away? In the raigne of the Quenes Ma-
iestie that now is, haue you not folowed what so euer change
is propounded? And yet did you not once confesse to mee
plainely in Sarisburie, when ye came thither in uisitation, that
you neuer liked the Supremacie of the temporal Princes ouer
the Church of England? Did you not tel mee, that it stood
neither with Scripture, nor with Doctours, nor with the
iudgement of the Learned men of Germanie, Geneva, and
the parties where you had ben? And why then preach you not
this Doctrine abroade?

To M. Jewel.

Is this y^e part of a constant man, at home to thinke one thing, as
broad to mainrein an other? Do you not hereby much like *Agri-*
cureans, who abroad speake of the *Goddess*, as other men do, at
home belene no *Goddess* to be at al? If upon examination you
wil denye this much, is not that also the parte of an inconstant
man? whether you wil abide by it or no before your betters, I
know not, certainly you letted not freely to tel me, that was
your opinion then.

what fault so ever you finde with my chaunge, certaine it is
al changes be not reynouable. He chaungeth wel, that chaun-
geth from evil to good. It is a happy chaunge, that is made from
errorr to truth, from schisme to vnitie, frō heresie to right faith,
from contempt of Religion, to the loue of Religion, from darke-
nesse to light, from pride to humilitie, from pleasing men, to su-
by how to please God. who so ever maketh this chaunge, he is
not to be accompted mutable, nor inconstant.

Some there be, that had rather suffer death, then be sent at
any time to haue ben out of the way. Some least they should
seme once to haue erred, do alwayes erre, and whiles they can
not abide any smal portion of their reputation to be diminished,
they cast away al together, line with note of perpetual infamie,
and fall into horrible heresies. Such, that they appaere not in-
constant, be made obstinate. They be most proude that thus do.
who wil seme Goddess, not men. We are men M. Jewel, and
as men we haue erred, and may erre, let vs pray, that we do no
more erre. so long as we folow the Catholike Church, we be sure
not to erre. Let vs so line, that errour be not punishment of
our sinnes. Specially let vs beware, that with wil and harr,
wittingly and stubbornly we neither choose vnto vs, nor defend
any erroneous point by our iudgement, and in our owne know-

To M. Iewel.

ied & condemned, as Arius, as Macedonius, as Nestorius, as Eutyches, and sundry other blasphemous heretikes haue done.

Whether you do like as they did, or no, I leave it to due consideration. Clergy who is ever wil take the paines to reade this Reioynde, by diligent conference of both our treatises, he shal see you dealing to be such, as you may seme equal to them in malice, and farre to passe them in vanitie of lying.

All they that mainteine vnt ruth, must nedes vse craft and falshe. For vnt ruth can not be vpholden, but by vnt ruth. Hereof it cometh, that the maintainers of the sundry sectes of our time be found so impudent liars. Yet of all that haue written since thes Luther began, for lying you deserue the garland. There neuer wrote any that within like quantitie of paper, hath vttered the like number of Vnt ruthes. As the Poetes saie, that what so euer Odias toucheth, it became golde: so may we truly say, that what so euer is brought against you for proufe of the truth, by one crafty sleight or other, if you passe it not ouer with silence, you put a falsse colour vpon it. And commonly what you bring for your owne parte, it is coyued with the same stampe.

I say not only, as you do in your Preface, but in this Reioynde I do manifestly proue in due place, Some Doctours by you to be vnt ruthly alleged, Some corruptly translated, Some peruerfly expounded, Some guilefully applied: Their wordes sometimes abridged, sometimes enlarged, sometimes altered, sometimes dissembled. With these falsse sleighes you burthen me in worde, with the same I haue here charged you in dede: Sundry annient Fathers which you denie, by good authoritie I haue anonched. Your owne childish Argumentes falsly and fondly by your self deuised, and fathered vpon me, I haue wholly contemned, and so returned them vnto you againe. For the
45. Vnt ruthes, which you pretend to haue notes in my Answer touching

To M. Jewel.

touching your first Article, I haue returned vpon you. 225. noted in your Replie of the same Article. Those which you impute vnto me, be now already partly, and may shortly be iustified, and therefore proued not to be Contritties at al. Yours you shal neuer iustifie: when you attempt it, you shal do it but with a multiplication of infinite other Contritties.

Sith it is thus, the best aduise I can geue you, is, first, to consider better of these maters, and to cal to your minde what hath moued you to enter so farre: next, how faithfully you haue dealt in the same: then, what rewarde you may looke for in the ende. If your conscience tel you, that at the beginning you were stirred vp with vaine glorie, with the praise of the people, with hope of worldly promotion, with pride, with singularitye, with the opinion of your owne conceiued excellencie: that you haue proceeded and folowed your purpose altogether without plaine and vpright dealing, with guile and craft, with wresting and racking the Scriptures, with misalleging, misconstruing, falsifying, and corrupting the holy and learned Fathers, with denying the autoritie of certaine who haue in olde tyme ben wel allowed, with counterfeited aduantages taken of patches and preces of Doctours, not folowing the Faith and intent of the Doctours, and with other the like suttel and deceitful sleights: that after your parte is plaied, you shal be brought to iudgement, there to render a streight accompt of al your wordes, sayinges, wrtinges, thoughtes, desires, meaninges, and iactances, and for them to receiue the rewarde of everlasting damnation, because they were altogether bent against the Catholike faith, to the defacing of the Church, and to the breach of vnitie: If your conscience vpd good, wise, & mature deliberatiō shal set these thinges before you, & as it were in a lincly paterne represent you vnto your self:

CCCC iii.

what

To M. Iewel.

what is healthful for you to do in this case, but with meeke and humble submission to condemne your arrogant boasting, with sincere and simple truth, to renoue your manifold craftes and falsheed, with harry, earnest, and vnfained repentance, to turne away Gods vengeance from you, and doing the worthy suites of penance, to procure vnto you pardon, fauour, and mercie:

If this counsel can not sincke into you, if neither this, nor any other the like aduise shal take place with you: what is my parte to do, but to leaue you to your selfe, and to the will of God: If you wil in any wise write more booke, let them be such, as shal not pester vs so with infinite numbers of vntruthes. Use fewter wordes, you shal make fewter lyes: leaue nipping, beweing, hacking, and mangling the Doctours: leaue to take away what is against you, and to adde of your owne, what is for you. Alter not their sayings by disordering their wordes, by false translation, by ouerthwarte and contrary vnderstanding. Leane to do, as not only through your whole Replie, but also as in the first Article (which here specially I note) you haue donne. That is to say, proue not your Doctrine that is against the Church, by the autorities of them, who be enemies to the Church. Allegt vs no more Gerardus Lopezius, and Georgius Cassander against the Masse, who are professed enemies of the Masse as y^e Church apponeth it, and therefore be condemned of the Church. Bring vs no more the witness of a few Schismaticke Brekes of late yeres, affirming Consecration of the body and bloud of Christ to be made by the priestes prayers, and not by the wordes of our Lord, against the catholike Church both Greke and Latine, specially whereas for the same errour they be manifestly reponed and refused, not only by the Latines, but also by the Brekes themselves.

Beſarion
de ſacra-
mento Eu-
chariſtie.

Furnish not your selfe, as commonly you doe, with the
Obiects

To M. Jewel

objections made by Schoole doctors by way of disputation
against the truth, pretending that they do speake in declaration of
resolution of the truth. To the Innocentius tertius, S. Thomas,
Securus, and Bonaventura, propound the argumentes and reasons
of Heretikes, to chintene by solution of them the truth may
apppeare the clearer: abuse not your vnlarned Reader with this,
bearing him in hand, they are the resolute sayinges, mindes, and
censures of those Doctours, where you see certayne errorres and
abuses condemned by Councels, leaue to alleage them, as
things once generally vsed and approued by the Church.

If you intend to write against any of our Treatises, cut
not out our sayinges forth of a whole heape, as your manner
is, leauing what toucheth the point in controuersie, and taking
parte that being put alone and besides the rest, seemeth to haue
least force. Deale plainly, lay forth the whole of the pith of the
whole, distimble not the force of your Aduersaries reasons. Wile
no more the false, but very grosse parte, that throught your
Replie commonly you haue vsed. which is this. You take by
peeces my sayinges, you falsifie, alter, change and frame them
to your fantasie, and when you haue made them weake and found-
ling like to the purpose, for which they were first vittered, then
you shew your worthy courage, then you geue your selfe the
victory, then you blow vp the triumph. Likewise you demean
your selfe with childish argumentes of your owne deuising, and
make gay sport at them, pretending they are of my making.
Wherewith practise aguerth a childish witte, and a delight in
hypocritizing. If you wil needs write more, amend to beterin you
haue offended. I meane not that you should amend what is
amiss in your Replie, for that is altogether false and faulty, to
amend that, is to new make it. For none other way wil serue
but to throw al in the tier, and cast it in a new mould againe,

A i Remember

To M. Iewel.

Remember M. Iewel, it is the cause of God, you would
 strive to create. God hath no neede of your Lyes. Leave twan-
 gling, teasing, scorning, mocking, scoffing: Consider not abound-
 ing wordes and syllables, forsaking the matter, Obscure not truth
 with vaine Rhetorique, ouerwhelme it not with your abun-
 dance of wordes. Bring not confusion to the matter, when it is
 cleare of it selfe, make not shew of victorie, where you are least
 able to answer. Make not your reader to laugh, where he
 would be taught. Affect not so much to be pleasant, seeke rather
 to be a true handler of Gods causes. Put not the hope of your
 victorie in the coldnesse of your Adversarie, but in the truth of
 the matter. Refuse not to stande to their iudgement alleged against
 you, whose witness you bring for you. Allow not a witness in one
 place, condemning him in an other place.

If you will vse the testimonies of the Schoolemen and Ca-
 nonistes, consider it to be reason, that you subscribe to their faith.
 It is well knowne unto you, they be catholike in doctrine, as
 whom therefore you account for; Papistes: Yet who ever alleged
 them so thicke as you haue doime (though to no purpose) in your
 Replie? It seemeth you were desirous to shew al your wares at
 one market. Vse their testimonies and beleue them. If you be-
 lieue them not, what means you to vse them? By this it appea-
 reth you seeke not so much to set forth the truth, as to ouerhaule
 your Adversarie. This is not to serue God: It is to gett praise
 among light and deceived men. Fill not vp your treatises with
 often and large handling of idle & superfluous Common places
 for the use of learning, vntoing much matter impertinent, which
 need not in question. Forsake your common soueraine custome of
 putting away one truth by the promise of an other truth. Leave
 to fill your readers heares with vaine and false tales, whereof
 you utter great store, repeating therein as great things, some in
 despite

To M. Iewel.

despite of Gods Ministers, some in contempt of the most holy
~~Scriptures.~~

whether can you make so much addo with me for one Tullid of S.
 Basile, which notwithstanding is reported by men of good credite,
 remember your owne selfe are not habile so wel to infittie your
 ownesables, which you tel at the beginning, as that Pope Bee-
 gozie, whom you had rather cal Hildebrand, was a Necromancer
 and a Souerer: that Emperour Henrie was poisoned in the Communion
 bread; that Pope Victor was poisoned in the Chalice. Take better heede
 from hence forth, and beware you make not so many & so plaine
 Contradictions in your owne tale, and that you be not founde
 so contrary to your selfe, for that must nedes abase your credite
 among those that be most wilfully addicted unto you.

In the
 first Arti-
 cle of the
 Replie, &
 the first
 division.

Above al thinges haue better regarde to your honestie, that
 you impute it not, I wil not say, with so many Untruthes, of
 which some may seme to haue a colour of truch, but with so
 many, so notorious, and so impudent Lyes, for which you can
 haue no colour, nor so much as any shadow of colour at al. And
 least I should seme to slander you, I wil here put you in
 minde of that or soure, not pyked out of the whole heape of your
 Replie, but deprehended in your first Article. To put in al here
 that I finde in that Article, it were ouer long, and to reherse al
 y I finde in your whole booke, it were to write an other booke.

You say of Albertus Pighius, that he acknowledgeth errors in the
 Masse. This is utterly false, he acknowledgeth no such thing, nor
 maketh any mention at al of any errors in the Masse. For
 the rest which I intend to note here I wil not secke farre abroad
 for them. They lye together (looke who wil) within the com-
 passe of litle more, then one leafe of your booke.

You say that S. Hierome by the reports of Eusebius maketh

Page 2.

in a small, discol. error in the first division. not 4. 1. in the first

To M. Iewel.

In Peror-
atione
transla-
toris. Ope-
rum Ori-
genis
parte 2.

mention only of one Epistle of Clementes, that he thought worthy to be received. This is controlled as utterly false by S. Hierome himselfe, who maketh mention of an other booke of S. Clementes, which he translated himselfe into Latine at the request of Gaudentius a bishop, as S. Hierome writeth in the ende of Origens Commentaries vpon the Epistle to the Romaines, which he turned into Latine.

You say further of S. Clementes booke which I alleaged, intituled Constitutiones Apostolorum, that it was disallowed by Eusebius, and by S. Hierome, and condemned by Gelasius: that it was neuer heard of, nor sene before: and that it was laid vp in secrecie for the space of a thousand six hundred yeres and more. Al this is utterly false, Eusebius and S. Hierome neuer disallowed that booke, but the disputation betwene S. Peter and Appion. It was Itinerarium Petri, that Gelasius condemned, not this. Albeit if it were neuer sene, nor heard of before, how was it by Eusebius & S. Hierome disallowed? could they disallow that was neuer sene nor heard of? If it were disallowed, how was it not at least heard of? This booke was heard of, sene, and read before our time, of diuerse and sundry fathers of sundry ages. Of Athanasius by reposit of Zonaras, of Cyrillus Hierosololymitanus, of Epiphanius, of the ancient wyiter of opus imperfectum vpon S. Mathew, of Damascen, of Proelus, of Oecumenius, of Nicolaus Methonensis, of Marcus Ephesius, as I shew more at large in my Reioindre.

pag. 3. You report Wolphgangus Lazius, whom you cal Zazius, to say, that S. Luke the Euangelist writing the Actes of the Apostles, borrowed many whole stories worde by worde out of Abdias. Lazius saith not so. He speaketh disinctly, that it is to be thought, that either Abdias tooke certayne thinges out of S. Luke, or S. Luke tooke out of Abdias, seeing both liued in one time, & were the Apostles scholars.

To M. Iewel.

You say f. S. Augustine reporteth the fables of S. Thomas, of S. Mathew, of S. Andrew, of the Lion that slew the adder (every mā may see f. place in your booke) and in such order, as they be set forth by Abdias. For proufe hereof by your note in f. marger, you direct your Reader to S. Augustine contra Faustum, lib. 11. & lib. 22. cap. 80. Where you haue falsly thrust in the names of S. Mathew, and of S. Andrew, thereby to discredit the Sacrifice of the Masse reported in Abdias by them to haue ben donne. I chalenge you of a fowle spee, until you shew vs out of the places by you quoted, or els where in those bookes, that S. Augustine reporteth any such fables, as you cal them, of S. Mathew, and of S. Andrew. Sure it is, that you haue belied S. Augustine. He writeth no such thing of them, as Abdias telleth. Much lesse reporteth he the thinges which you reherse, such in such order as they be set forth by Abdias.

In the same place you falsifie and corrupte S. Augustine beyonde al reason. You tel as out of him, what was written not by him, but in a false booke of one Leucius entituled the Actes of the Apostles, concerning Maximilla wife vnto Egeus, how she (being once chaste) would no more yelde durie vnto her husband, but set Euclia her maide in her vyrgine place. Having reheried this much, you say: Al these and such like tales, haue falsly by S. Augustine, are reported by M. Hardinges Abdias in great sooth. This is a most impudent spee. By Abdias Maximilla is reported to haue ben a very godly woman, & the discipule of S. Andrew. Of her deuyng durie to her husband, contrary to S. Pauls wordes, & of that filthy placing of her maide Euclia in her owne stede, in al Abdias there is no such much as one worde. Neither is that maide Euclia, that so much as once named by Abdias. I may please the reader to see, what I write vpon this mater in my vttermost. If there be so many eyes founde with in lesse then one leafe and a halfe, the Reader may conceiue what a multitude is to be founde in the whole scripture.

1. Cor. 7.

To M. Iewel.

For the rest of the first Article, I referre you to this Treatise, where you and the Reader shal finde good hope of your lyen, Untruthes, corruptions, and falsifyinges, and of your other false dealinges, plainly laid forth, and clearly confuted. If men be not utterly blinde, and as I may say, so bewitched with the spiritte of errour and lying, as to beleue what so euer you say, be true, be it false; I doubt not but after they shal haue read my Treisurie, and what is written by others here of late: in their iudgement your Replie shal finde small credite. Now to ende, If you feare not God, to whom of so many Untruthes you shal geue accompt, yett reuerence man, of whose wordly estimation you depende. For my parte, I shal pray, that either God mane your harte to repent and amende, or that he geue the people grace not to beleue you.

At Antwerpe. In the ende of August. 1568. In which time your brethren of this low Countie professors of that we call the Gospel, haue geuen euident testimonie to y^e world, with what spiritte they be lead by their spoiling and robbing of Churches and religious houses, by destruction of Libraries, by threatening to spere the places where they be resisted, & with other wicked outrages: through occasion whereof of this Treatise could not be printed neither so speedily, nor so exactly, as in quiet times it might haue ben.

Thomas Harding.

Cyprianus Pupiano lib. 4. epist. 9.

Habes tu, literas meas, & ego tuas. In die Iudicij ante tribunal Christi utrumq; recitabitur.

Thou hast my booke (of Answer) and I haue thine (of Replie). In the day of Iudgement before the iudgement seate of Christ, both shal be recited.

Faults escaped in printing.		
Leaf	Line	Fault
10. A.	3.	how in forme
11. B.	13.	more in the last
12. B.	3.	marcella
13. A.	27.	the
16. A.	10.	are
35. B.	1.	by report of Abbas
36. A.	15.	not of Abbas
36. B.	4.	that he
37. A.	1.	be pointes
37. A.	11.	there
46. A.	31.	μοναστηριον
57. A.	31.	for
66. B.	11.	Ceremonical
71. A.	14.	vs not
100. B.	1.	so
101. B.	9.	or
104. B.	13.	purpose
111. B.	11.	Transubstantion
111. B.	11.	Transubstantiation.
114. B.	1.	The. 14. Division
114. B.	1.	The. 11. Division.
161. A.	13.	and such
161. A.	13.	not onely.
162. B.	21.	pe
162. B.	21.	be.
165. A.	11.	for he meant
165. A.	11.	for if he meant.
171. A.	2.	anthropophagia
171. A.	2.	anthropophagiam.
173. A.	4.	cine
173. A.	4.	seme.
186.	19.	his sole retaining
186.	19.	this sole etc.
189.	18.	Abastardus de Bixia
189.	18.	Abastardus, Arual-
190.	22.	duk de etc.
190.	22.	taken
190.	22.	taken.
190.	22.	saluation
190.	22.	saluation.

Other faults that may be espied should have been corrected, had not the troubles here begun to force vs to make an end.

1. The first thing that must be done is to
 correct the errors in the original text.
 2. The second thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

3. The third thing is to make sure that
 the text is correct and easy to read.
 4. The fourth thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

5. The fifth thing is to make sure that
 the text is correct and easy to read.
 6. The sixth thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

7. The seventh thing is to make sure that
 the text is correct and easy to read.
 8. The eighth thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

9. The ninth thing is to make sure that
 the text is correct and easy to read.
 10. The tenth thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

11. The eleventh thing is to make sure that
 the text is correct and easy to read.
 12. The twelfth thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

13. The thirteenth thing is to make sure that
 the text is correct and easy to read.
 14. The fourteenth thing is to make sure that
 the text is clear and easy to read.

A REIOINDRE Fol. 1.

TO M. IEVVELS

REPLIE.

Ieuvel.

There appeareth smal hope that M. Harding will deale plainly in the rest, that thus maketh his first entrie with a caull.

For where as the mater is knownen, and agreed vpon, it is great folie to pyke quarell vpon the vwoorde. Every Masse 3 (sayth he) is common, and none priuate. If it be so, then hath he already concluded fully on our side. For if there be no priuate Masse 4 at all, then was there no Priuate Masse in the primitive Church, which was my first assertion.

But M. Harding, as may be gathered by his manner of proofes, is not yett resolued, neither vvhath is Priuate, nor vvhath is Masse. For in the .22. article of his booke, intreating of the accidentes of breade and wyne, to the intent to auoide the grosse absurdities that followe Transubstantiation, he sayth, These maters were neuer taught in open audience, but privately disputed in the schooles, and set abroad by learned men in their priuate wryttinges. There he calleth that thing priuate, that is disputed in open audience, in the hearing of five hundred, or more, and is set abroad to the knowledge of the world. And here the thing that is done by the priest and his boys alone in a corner, he calleth common. Thus he maketh vwoordes to sounde vvhath him listeth, sometyne common to be priuate, sometyne priuate to be common at his pleasure.

And as touching Masse, sometime he maketh it a

The first Intruth. for it is no caull, as it shall appeare.

The 2. intruth. It is nat knowen, nor agreed vpon.

The 3. intruth. I say not so, but with addition; which maketh certaine limitation.

The 4. Intruth. It is not laide there is no priuate Masse at all. for there is priuate Masse, as priuate is take in an other sense.

The 5. intruth. In place I speake not hereof, but of M. Ieuvels. b. last Articles.

The 6. intruth. I say not so, but otherwise.

A Reioindre to

The. 7. vnt ruth. I Sacrifice : somety me the 7 Communion : somety me the pray-
neuer saide the Com- ers : and so seemeth not yett well to knowe, vpon what
munion to be? Masse grounde to stande.

His First reason is this : The Sacrifice of the Priest is
common , therefore the Masse is Common . Here might
be demaunded , why gaue the Priest authoritie, to make
this Sacrifice ? and without authoritie how can he
make it ? But if his Sacrifice be common, why 8 dothe he
giue it these priuate titles, This for the liuing, This for the
deade : This for a frende : This for him selfe?

The. 8. vnt ruth. I
giue not the Sacri-
fice these titles.

The. 9. vnt ruth. It

is no errour to say, the
Communion which is
in the Masse, is a feast

His second reason is this : It is a feast, and therefore it is
common: and thus he salueth one 9 errour with an other.
For if it be a feast, how is it receiued by one alone? If it be
receiued by one alone, how can it seeme to be a feast? But
he saith, it is prepared for al. Verely it is but final. promise
to serue so many. The priest him selfe knoweth this is vn-
true. He prepareth for him selfe, and not for others : He
speaketh to him selfe, and not vnto the congregation : He
receiveth him selfe alone, and not with his brethren. There-
fore in this respecte we must needes say, the Masse is priuate
and not common.

Harding.



HEREAS my Iewel in the beginning of
his Booke layeth to my charge, that in my
Answer to his Challenge I make my firste
entrie with a Causil, and would thereby re-
mone the Reader from hope of plaine dea-
ling on my parte in the rest : how much my
entrie reporteth no other thing but a Trowth, so much both
blame of an euil disposition cleaueth on him, thus quarreling-

by finding faulte where none is, and the Reader remaineth in hope notwithstanding, to see me in this matter to deale plainly.

The Camil for which so hastily he reprehendeth me at the first, is, for saying that every Masse is publike, concerning both the Oblation, and also the Communion, and none private. which is true, as there I proue it. And in dede the Oblation which Christ made of him selfe once vpon the Crosse for remission of synnes, apperteyning not to one person, nor to one Degree of men only, nor to one nation peculiarly, as Moyses lawe did to the Jewes, but to al right beleuers in general, every one receiuing his saluation therof: that which is offered in the blessed Sacrifice of every Masse being the selfe same, though the manner of Offering be diuerse: in that respect for good cause every Masse is to be accounted publike, and not private.

In what respect is every Masse publike.

Pla. 147.

The Communion also of Christs body is a publike feast, by Christs Institution ordeined to be the foode of our soules. For that body, as it was borne not for one only, but for al, as it suffered not for one only, but for al: so it is geuen also to be meate, not for one only, but for al. Who so euer eateth of this bread, shal liue for euer (saith Christ). In this consideration, the Communion of that precious body consecrated of the Priest at the Masse by the almighty power of our Lordes word spoken in the person of Christ, is duly called a publike feast. And so in respect of the same, as well as of the Oblation, the Masse is publike. Though others beside the Priest, through negligence, and lacke of deuotion forebears to receiue: yet the thing to be receiued, ceaseth not to be publike and common, nor is it to be accounted for private, because others refusing, one receiueth sacramentally in one place alone.

That the Communion is a publike feast.

Iohn. 6.

The Priestes special Acte of receiuing alone, somewhat in respect of place, I graunt is private, without any offence of his

The Priest receiuing alone, is not the Masse private.

W. H. Jewels

A Reioindre to

parte; but that maketh not the Masse private. For the Hoste and Sacrifice considered in it selfe, which he receiveth, that not withstanding is Publike, neither therefrom is any excluded, that of the same sheweth him selfe worthy and willing. As a Conduicte builded in a Citie for the commoditie of the Citizens, is publike and common, though there be but one that fetcheth water of it at once: So is the Communion of our Lordes body by the priest at his Masse Consecrated, though others besides him, refuse to receive it, a Publike and Common banket. And that it is so, it dependeth not of the receivers parte, but of the thing it selfe.

But M. Jewel lacking psonse for his saying, only affirmeth it stoutely, pretending it to be graunted of all men. Where the matter (saith he) is knownen and agreed vpon, it is great folie to pike quarel vpon the yvorde. True it is.

But why did he not psonse it to be knownen and agreed vpon? First, knownen it is not, that every Masse, at which the Priest hath not Company to Communicate with him Sacramentally, is private. For knowledge is only of true thinges, and this is not true, as I haue now declared.

Againe, agreed vpon it is not, for the Catholikes deny it, and M. Jewel anonceth. Certaine it is, that before Martin Luther, no Auncient and Good wytter euer called the Masse private, in respect of the Priestes Sole Receiuing.

After this Cant, he twisseth me with foule ouersight and vn-waierable, as though vnadvisedly I had detested wordes concluding with the enemies of the holy Sacrifice, and consequently

with him against my selfe. Hereto he allegeth my wordes false, leading out that which might answer the Obiection, and making me to speak what I did then I do, as the place of my booke lying before the Readers eyes, speaketh for me. For I say not privately, every Masse is Common, and none private, as he reporteth. But every Masse is publike concerning both the Ob-

lation,

lation, and also the Communion, and none private. whereby
 adding concerning the Oblation and Communion, I make a
 Limitation of Publike, and in that respect exclude private.
 This notwithstanding M. Jewel hoping to conuery him self safe
 away as it were in a cloude with a Sophisticall Argument, that
 in Schooles we tal Paralogisme, thus concludeth against me,
 that, if it be so, then haue I already Concluded fully on his side. Ther-
 vpon taking more, then before he imagined to be granted vnto
 him, he proceedeth forth boldly, saying: If there be no Priuate Masse at
 all, then was there no Priuate Masse in the Primitive Church, which was
 my first Affection. And here he sheweth himselfe a
 This is M. Jewels accustomed Sophistry. First he falsify-
 eth my words, and by Clipping, and Changing the Sentence,
 frameth them to his purpose; then he borroweth an Antithese, after
 that he hath set an illle. For neither was it by me simply
 granted, that every Masse shold be what to euery sence is com-
 mon, and much lesse, that there is no private Masse at al, that
 is to say, in no respects. For within fewe lines after, the con-
 trary by me is confessed. He that maketh this Argument, The Masse is not private
 in respect of the Oblation & Communion; Ergo there is no pri-
 uate Masse at al; reasoneth as well; as if a man shoulde say, M.
 Jewel is not a true man, concerning his Doctrine and manner
 of writing; Ergo he is no true man at al. The reason is naught.
 For though he be an vtrue man in that point, yet he may be a
 true man in an other point: As for example; in confessing
 that with substantiall Learning he shall neuer be able to defende
 his insolent Challenge. who so ever hath learned Logike; can
 not forget Aristotles rule, that a secundum quid ad simpliciter,
 the Argument is naught.

Thus the reproch of a Caud, with which M. Jewel begin-
 neth

M. Jew:
 chief Sophistry sheweth in falsifying wordes & sayings.

Fol. 9.b.

A Reioindre to

meth his Booke, is returned vpon him. And because he wil seme to play the good Auditor in making an exacte accompte of pretenced vntuthes noted in my Answer, least I shuld seme to remaine in his debte, and therfore to sie reckening with him: I wil that this be noted for the first vntuth, in that he would haue spotted my first entrie with the dishonnestie of a Canil, where none is.

The second vntuth is his second sentence, wher he saith, & matter (whereby he meaneth that the Masse is Dyname) to be knowen and agreed vpon, for certainly it is not agreed vpon in the Catholike Church after Luthers sense. The third vntuth is the deceit of falsifying in the third sentence, where he falsifieth my wordes. The fourth vntuth is a false proposition taken in as graunted by me, which I graunte, not that there is no Dyname Masse at al, whereof he inferreth the false conclusion of his first Article. With these foure false vntuthes within the space of vii. lines, hath M. Jewel garnished the first entrie of his Booke, whereby he getteth the Reader so vnderstand, what flowers he is like to gather out of that garden. This noting of vntuthes, is obuius I graunte, and beside the custome of learned men, neither would I haue vsed it at al, had not I importunitie of M. Jewels former example compelled me thereto.

M. Jewel
piketh
quarrel for
vse of cer-
taine
termes.

As from this much like rough and like pions he obiecteth vnto my maintenance of Prouins, as not being yet resolved, neither what is Dyname, nor what is Masse. For the first he reporteth him to a place of the ix. Article of my booke, where he saith that I create a newe substance of bread and wine, in the instant of time, the words of Christe that followe in all translation, which words I haue receiued for the first vntuth. I say, that at that place I point not therof, but of the last five Articles of M. Jewels Challenge to be considered altogether, terming them noble points, whose discussion

cussion is more curious, then necessarie. But is liked him to say somewhat that might sound in contempt of the miraculous Transubstantiation, though he said neuer so vntuly.

Here againe he falsifieth my wordes making me to say thus. These matters were neuer taught in open audience, but privately disputed in the schooles, and set abroad by learned men in their Private writings.

Thus hauing with his falsifying sleight framed my wordes to his aduantage, he triumpheth ouer me, and concludeth a great absurditie against me, as though there I called that thing Private, which is disputed in open audience, in the hearing of five hundred or more, and is set abroade to the knowledge of the worlde, and here that thing common, which is done by the priest and his boye alone in a corner. And thus I make (saith he) wordes to sound what he feeleth, Common to be Private, and Private to be Common at my pleasure.

Now take the paines good Reader to betwe the place in my Booke, and there shalt thou finde these very wordes spoken of the subtiltie and curiositie of the Doctrine of M. Jewels line last Articles. Yet (say I) this matter hath not so much ben taught in open audience of the people, as debated privately betwene learned men in schooles, and so of them set forth in these Private writings.

Fo. 182. b

Who compareth M. Jewels false allegation, and my wordes together, shall easily perceiue no small difference. And as I speake, what canst can be made of them? I say not falsely as M. Jewell reporteth my wordes, that these matters were neuer taught in open Audience, but that the subtile pointes of those five Articles haue not so much ben taught in open audience of the people. whereby my meaning is euident, that the vniuersities were not taught that Doctrine out of the Pulpit. And why did M. Jewell in referring my wordes leaue out mention of the people?

A Reioindre to

Asked he not my *Antithesis* betwene open Audience, and Schooles betwene the People and Learned men? betwene Open in respect of the Pulpit, and Priuate in respect of Scholastical debating? Yes verely, he could not but espye it, whose best sight is in the figures of Rhetorike.

Schoole
points are
priuate in
comparis
of maters
set forth in
Pulpits.

showe

For truth of the mater, what man is there of any vnderstanding, to whose indgement things debated among the Schoole men in Scholastical disputations, and by such put in writing, seeme not to be priuately created, in comparison of those things, which be set forth in Sermons to al Chyisten people, and with such plainnesse of stile and Language committed to writing, as is fit for the capacitie of most men; whereas the Schoole learning for the Subtiltie and Obscuritie of many high pointes, is not wel perceined, but of such as haue their senses much exercised in that trade of studie? what learned man knoweth not, that Cicero oftentimes calleth the studie of Philosophie, Vmbra, Shadowe, and the exercise of Oratours and Lawyers, Lumen, Light: wherein he had consideration of the place, in which these professions had their exercise? what difference he maketh betwene being Domi, and in Foro, the same we make betwene Schooles, and Haukes Crosse, or generally the Pulpits. Thus I make good, that I haue vsed my termes Priuate, and Comon rightly, wherein Mr. Jewel mangleth, and seeketh occasion to reprove me, where iustly none is ministered. Therfore let this be accounted for an other vntruth, where he saith, I make vvorde to founde what me listeth, so as Common be Priuate, and Priuate be Comon at my pleasure.

Now as touching the Masse, which he saith I am not yet resolved what it is, but make it sometime the Sacrifice, sometime the Communion, sometime the Prayers: true it is, that in the 22. Article, where I treat of Opus Operatum, the better to shewe what it

is, and whether it remone synnes, whereto M. Jewels Challenge leaureth me: I declare, that the terme Masse may be taken two waies. Either for the thing it selfe which is offered, or for the act of the priest in offering it. which I haue not done altogether without skil, and the same could I here iustifie, if the place so required. As for the Communion considered aparte, I neuer make it the Masse.

The whole summe of prayers, lessons, psalmes, hymnes, inuocations, &c. called by diuers names, and distincted into diuers partes (whereby I vnderstand the whole seruice touching that blessed sacrifice) I do and may iustly call the Masse: as where I speake of S. James Masse, of S. Basiles Masse, of S. Chrysostomes Masse. So in olde time the first parte of it was called Missa catechumenorum, the later part, Missa perfectorum. which is from the pface foreward to the ende, and in that sense the booke which containeth that whole seruice, is called the Masse booke.

The seruice of the Masse is sometime called Masse.

where I saie that no man offereth that dreadfull sacrifice pynately for him selfe alone, but for the whole Church in common, bying that, as also that the Communion of the Sacrament is a publike feast, to proue the Masse to be publike, and not pynate: Herevpon M. Jewel hauing mangled my wordes, & uttering the otherwise then I do, maketh an argument as on my behalfe, to proue the Masse to be common. Then citions he saith, It might be demaunded vbo gaue the priest auctoritie to make this sacrifice, and without auctoritie (saith he) how can he make it? Herevnto I saie.

Fol. 9. a

First, that how so euer he putteth forth my reason weakely, as I my selfe conclude, he shal neuer be able to disproue it, but that thereby the Masse is proued publike. Next, touching his surmised demaunde, vbo gaue the priest auctoritie to make this Sa-

A Reioindre to

Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11

crifice, the scripture telleth him it was Christe, who said to his Apostles, do, or make ye this in my remembrance. For this point let the Reader peruse that I wrote vpon the. 17. Article of M. Jewels Challenge, and what shal be said hereafter, when I shal treate more thereof, and he shall finde his demaunde fully answered.

But if his Sacrifice be common (saith M. Jewel) vvhy doth he geue it these Priuate titles, This for the liuing: This for the dead: This for a frende: This for him selfe? Hereto I answer. First, the Sacrifice is not mine, as his scoffing spite vttereth. It is the Sacrifice of Christe chiefly, offered by the ministerie of a priest of the newe testament, in the person of the Church, wherof Christe principally is the priest, the offerer, and the Oblation, saith S. Augustine.

Aug. de Ci-
uitate Dei.
lib. 10. cap.
20.

Then it may please him to vnderstand, that neither I, nor any other Catholike man, do geue to that most blessed Sacrifice, these Priuate titles, speaking properly and exactly. It is not a Sacrifice properly for any priuate thing, person, or persons, but generally for al: per by the intention of the Priest, it may be applied to one more then to another. Christe hath shed his blood, and offered him selfe a bloody Sacrifice vpon the Crosse for al. For al likewise, whom Christe admitteth to that benefite, is this vnbloody Sacrifice, being the selfe same with that of the crosse in truth of the thing offered, and the sampler of that, in regard of the manner of offering.

The Sa-
crifice is
Publique

In the celebration of this vnbloody Sacrifice we praise, and do what in vs lieth, that by our deuoute intention the healthfull vertue of that bloody Sacrifice may be applied to al in general, to certaine specially that liue, and to certaine that be dead, to our vere frendes, for whom we be most specially bound to praye, and to our selues. For these two haue special prayers in the Masse, and

and special remembrances. Neither foral that is the nature of that Sacrifice altered and made private, but remaineth publique and common, as our Lordes Prayer is a common prayer, though a man say it for him selfe, or for his special frende.

whereas I cal the Communion of the blessed Sacrament a publique feast, prouing the Masse in that respect also to be publique, and not private: M. Jewel hauing set forth my reason so bare and naked as he could deuise, denieth the antecedent, saying, that I salue one error with an other. For if it be a feast (saith he) how is it receiued by one alone? If it be receiued of one alone, how

can it seeme to be a feast? why Sir I praye you, can you not conceiue a feast to be a feast, except it be eaten of many gheastes? Is not the frast one thing, the gheastes an other? Neuer heard you one saye of a good Dymmer, which is a feast, Dymmer is ready, the gheastes be not come? If he saye true, who so saith, is there not then a feast, before the Gheastes come? And if they come not at al, shal not a feast be a feast? Saith not the king in the Gospel of the feast he had prepared at his sonnes wedding, Beholde I haue made ready my Dynner, whereas they that were hydden refused to come? Now if that were a feast wherof one alone receiued, why shal we not cal this diuine banquet a feast, wherof one alone receiuerh? Albeit in dede it is not at any time of one alone receiued, but sometimes in respect of place. For by this feast we vnderstand not one special pece of bread, or rather (after Consecration) the foyme of one particuler bread; but y most pretious body of our Lord, into which by th almighty power of the word of the Mystical benediction the bread is turned, which is the bread of life, sufficient to the sustenance of al. which is eaten of many through the world, being enery where one and the same, and is not consumed.

A feast
may be
receiued
without
gheastes.

Mat. 22.
Luc. 14.

A Reioindre to

And al they do Communicate together, be they in places neuer so farre distant.

The Co-
munion of
Christes
body, is
called a
feast.
Jo. x. i.
Epulum.

If M^r. Jewel would not haue it called a feast, let him quarel with the holy Martyr S. Ignatius, scholer to S. Polycarpe S. Johns scholer. who in his Epistle ad Smyrnenfes, calleth it Jo. x. i. a feast. Let him quarell with the auncient and learned fathers, who cal it Epulum, that is, a solemne or Publique feast. Let him quarel with the whole Church, which in worshop of it deuoutly singeth vnto it, O Sacrum conuiuium, O holy feast, &c. Had he not forsaken the faith of the Church, he would neuer haue denied this holy Sacrament to be a feast.

The want
of prouisi-
on can not
iustly be
complai-
ned of.

I saye this feast is prepared for al. Thereat he scoffeth, because of smal prouision, as though it were none other but a belly cheare. If he meane the prouision of the material bread, to be to litle to serue al at one Masse, as by his captious answer he seemeth to meane: he knoweth that neither al come to one Masse to receiue, and where any worthely require it, be they in any Church of Christendom neuer so many, they be admitted, and prouision is sone made ready. As for the bread to be vsed to that ende, when the priest understandeth there is none disposed to receiue with him, he staierh not frō doing his owne durie, and prouideth not in vaine for others, hauing notwithstanding a wil, and also an earnest desire, that others would dispose them selues, and be partakers with him of that heauenly foode, by Sacramental participation. This being so, there is no cause why M^r. Jewel shuld pike a quarel to vs, for that the prouision is so smal. Albeit how can it seme smal, sith none is vnprouided for, that duly requiereth it?

Private
vsage of a
thing in it
self comon
maketh it
not pri-
uate.

All that M^r. Jewel here proueth is nought els, but the Priestes sole receiuing, which we graunt to be sole and private touching y^e same place, when none els is wel disposed to be partaker with him

him. which sole receiuing notwithstanding, the Sacrifice of the Masse is a publike sacrifice, and so is the Communion of our Lordes body a publike feaste. For if soe bearing the vse of a thing that is publike and common, one only at certaine times vsing it, should alter the condition of the thing, and make it private: then were the kinges high waye made private, because sometimes there is but one that passeth through it. Then were a common well or Conduit in a towne made private, so that it happeth sometimes that one only person thereof fetcheth his water. whereof and of other the like thinges that might easily be brought for example, to say, that private vslage of them at certaine times maketh them private, it were very absurde.

The thirde reason touching the vvil of the Minister, is very vncertaine. For neither can the priest by his vwill alter nature, nor make that thing common, vvhich is Private: nor can any man certainly knowe, what thing the priest vvilleth. For vvhath if his vvil be to worke
 10 Necromancie, or Sorcerie, as it is reported of Pope Hildebrande? Or vvhath if his vvil be to
 11 poyson some bodie, as Henry the Emperour was
 12 poysoned in the communion bread: 12 Pope Victor in the chalice? Or vvhath if his vvil be to
 worke fained miracles, as 13 Lyra sayeth, many
 are vvrought in the open Church by the priest
 14 to mocke the people? Doubtles if the priestes
 vvil may be knowen, either by his vvordes, or by

The. 10. vnt ruth. This is not reported by any graue & true writer, but by them that flattered the Emperour of that time.

The. 11. vnt ruth, he was not so poysoned, but died otherwise.

The. 12. vnt ruth. He died otherwise.

The. 13. vnt ruth. Lyra saith it not. Dan. 14.

The. 14. vnt ruth. To mocke the people, is not in Lyra.

A Reioindre to

his doinges, or by his gesture, or by his prouision, or by the quantitie of his breade and wine, or by his vvhole vsage and practise, it may soone be seene, his vvill is to make a priuate banket, and not a common.

These be very vweake foundations to buylde vpon. Of the same M. Harding might rather and farre better haue geathered the contrarie. For if it be the common sacrifice of the vvhole Church, it should be offered by the vvhole church, as S. Ambrose saierh: *Vt multorum oblatio simul celebretur*: That the oblation of many may be made together.

False Translation,

If it be a common feast of the vvhole Church, it should be receiued commonly of the vvhole Church. And therefore 15 S. Hierome sayeth, *Dominica cœna omnibus debet esse communis*. The Lordes supper must be common to al, and that not for these simple shiftes that M. Harding and his fellowes haue diuised. S. Hieromes reason is this: *Quia dominus omnibus Discipulis, qui aderant, æqualiter tradidit Sacramenta*. Bycause the Lorde gaue the Sacramentes equally to al the Disciples that were present. These vwoordes be plaine, Equally, and To al the Disciples. And therefore saith S. Hierome, according to this example the Lordes supper must be common.

The. 15. vntreuth. For S. Hierome is not the author of those briefe Commentaries.

Harding.

where I say, the Communion of the Sacrament being common by order of the first Institution, and by will of the ministers, ought to be reputed for common & not priuate: *Ad. Heto.*
thereof

thereof taketh occasion by waye of wicked and false surmises, to talke his pleasure of the ministers wil, him selfe shewing a wil to bring the most holy thinges we haue in Christian religion; into contempt among the vnlarned people by his prophane lyes and false fables of Pope Hildebrandes Necromantie and Sorcerie, of Emperour Henries poisoning in the communion bread, of Pope Victors poisoning in the chalice; of fained Miracles wrought by the priest to mocke the people:

False fables wickedly soothed by M. Jewel to cause contempt of holy Scriptures.

But Hildebrandus (who being Pope, and named Gregorie the tenth, for the bishoply libertie which he vsed towards Henrie the fourth Emperour for his amendment; like to that which also S. Ambrose vsed towards Theodosius, was much hated and persecuted, and euill reported of by such writers of that time as flattered the Emperour) was by report of the true histories of that age, not only farre from exercising Necromantie or Sorcerie, but also in al singular vertues an excellent man, and a worthy bishop. For better knowledge of him what manner a man he was, for what cause he sustained both the displeasure of that Emperour, and was without deserte reproued and slandered of his adherentes, who refused to be brought to order: I remit the Reader to my Confutation of the Apologie, where he shal finde the matter partly touched, fo. 187. b. and be further aduertised whom to consulte for a large discourse thereof. 187. a.

Pope Hildebrandus for what cause despised.

Likewise there shal be finde the true histories alleged, how Henrie of Luxemburg the Emperour dyed not by poisoning, as M. Jewel here, and the autho; of the Apologie there reporteth, but otherwise: also that Victor the Pope died of a Dysenterie, as some haue witnessed, not of Poison received in the Chalice, as Martinus Polonus a vaine wyriter amonge

Henry the Emperours death. Fo. 183. b. 184. a. Pope Victor's death.

A Reioindre to

other sundry his vntruthes hath fabled, which M. Jewel would to be taken for a truth, the rather to discredite the most blessed Sacrifice.

As for the fained Miracles, which M. Jewel would his Readers to conceiue, that the priest hath a wil to worke, to the intent to bring priests into hatred: I demaunde of him, where Lyra saith that which he fathereth vpon him: that many fained miracles are wrought in the open Church by the priest to mocke the people?

Oh Master Jewel wil you neuer leane that falsched and falsity of yours? wil you neuer cease to falsifie the Doctors sayings that you allege: when truth is knowne, what winne you thereby, but the ouerthrow of your cause, and distrust of your credite?

Lyra hauing declared vpon the fourtieth Chapter of Daniel the manner how the false Idolatrous priests of Bel, for gaires deceiued the people, and made them belene, that Bel, which was but a Dragon was a great God, and wrought straunge things: speaketh thereupon of an abuse that sometime is committed in the Church. His wordes be these.

*Lyra in
14. Cap.
Danielis.*

Et similiter aliquando fit in ecclesia maxima deceptio populi in miraculis, fictis a sacerdotibus, vel eis adherentibus, propter lucrum temporale. Likewise, (saith he, sometime it happeth in the Church, that the people be greatly begiled in Miracles fained by Priests, or by their adherentes for vvorlly lucres sake. And to shewe that he spake this with a better spirit, then M. Jewel sheweth in alleging it, he concludeth thus. Et talia sunt extirpanda a bonis prelatibus, sicut ista extirpata sunt a Daniele. And such things are to be rooted out by good Prelates, as these were rooted out by Daniel.

As M. Jewel, you may see, the Catholikes dissemble not the
faulces and abuses that happen to be in the Church. They
confesse them willingly, and aduise the rulers of them, that
they maye quite be rooted out. Sir Thomas Moore hym
selfe that man of blessed memorie, so euill as they of your side re-
proue of him, both acknowlege and confesse, the abuse of fai-
ned Miracles, and declareth how in times past, they were mis-
liked and abhoyed of all good folke, whiche times you make,
to be the times of Antichrist, of Superstition, and Idolatry.

Sir Tho-
mas Moore
reproued
fained mi-
racles in
his Dia-
logue.

Now good Sir, Lysa speaketh not as you make him to
speak. He saith not, that many fained miracles are wrought, but
that the people be greatly deceaued sometime. He saith not,
in the open Church, but that it hapneth in the Church: where-
by he meaneth not the Materiall Church, as you doe, where
the Bishop saith Masse, but the State of the Gospell, since Chri-
stes Incarnation, and therein he maketh a secret comparison
of abuses between the Church and the Synagogue of the Jewes.
Neither saith Lysa such fained Miracles to be wrought by the
Priest (by whiche wordes you do your Reader to conceiue such
detestable practises to be done at the very Altar in the time
of the Holy Celebration) but by Priestes indefinitely, meaning
some euill among the great number. Neither doth he ascribe
the faining of Miracles to Priestes simply, but by way of correc-
tion, to them, or to their Adherentes, as Clerkes, Seruants,
or such other Ministers of base condition, whose power som-
time driueth them to deuile shifts to gaine wherewith to fill their
hungry bellies. Lastly, Lysa saith not this Enormitie to be
done, to mocke the People as you say, but Propter lucrum tempo-
rale, For Temporall gaine. Neither Priestes nor any creat-
ning to them be noted of Lysa, to be so wicked, as to committe
that Crime to mocke the People. That is your falsitieng to
make

Lysa true-
ly declared

A Reuindre to

make Priestes and their ministerie more odious; it is not
Lypas plaine saying.

the priestes
will is not
to make
Communion
a priu-
ate banquet

To answer the matter selfe offered, I thinke verily, how
like so euer good will M. Jewel beareth to Priestes, among
a thousand he shall not finde one, who lacketh a will to con-
secrate the Body of Christe, and to impart it vnto any Chri-
stian person, that being duly examined and prepared there-
fore, desyres to communicate with him. This bringeth
iudge no more M. Jewel of the Priestes unwillingnesse, by
his wordes, his doings, his gesture, his pronitiou, the
quantity of his Bricke and wine, his whole vsage and pra-
ctise, which you bring for a scoffing argument to proue, that
his will is to make a priuate banquet, and not a common.

That it be Publike and common, it is enough that it be
so by institution of Christe, and that as touching the Priest,
his will be not to the contrarie. Albeit in my answere I spake
not of the Communion, as it is receiued or ministered in par-
ticular, but in general. For though sometime it be receiued
but of one man at once in one particular place, yet is the same
receiued of many others aparte in sundry places, and remai-
neth whole and vndiuided, one and the same Body of Christe.
Who so receiuing communicate together, be they neuer so farre
asunder. And thus alwayes the Communion of that holy
Mysterie is a Publike and common feast.

Whereas M. Jewel diuideth his treasures vpon euery Article
into sundry partes, naming euery parte a Dimission, wherein
touching the placing of my matter, sometime he foloweth will,
more then reason, and thorow the whole, his owne deuise, not
minke: in the ende of his first Dimission, he bringeth that against
me, which I do wel allow, so it be rightly vnderstanded. That
is, that the Sacrifice of the Church, which we call the Masse, be
offered vp to God by the whole Church. True it is and there-
fore

foze it is called also the Sacrifice of the Church. S. Augustine speaking of Christ, how in forme of God he taketh sacrifice with the Father, in forme of a servant he had rather be a Sacrifice: saith, that he would the daily Sacrifice of the Church, of his Sacrifice to be a Sacrament, forasmuch as he is the head of that body, and she the body of that head, as well she by him, as he by her accustomed to be offered. But how it is offered by the Church, and how by the Priest, who is in this behalfe the common minister of the Church, by the Priest immediately, by the Church mediately or by meanes of the priest: at this haue I plainly declared in my Answer to his twentieth article.

If he meane, as it seemeth he doth, that the whole Church, that is to say, the whole people should offer the Sacrifice in such wise and manner as the priest doth, consecrating it, making the oblation, and receiuing it none otherwise then the priest doth: that doctrine is erroneous and absurde, neither do S. Ambroses wordes which he allegeth, proue the same. For he speaketh not of the Sacrament, but of the feastes that were kept in Churches after the mysteries had ben receiued, which feastes were commonly called Agape, wherof more hereafter.

If it be a common feast (saith he) of the whole Church, it should be receiued commonly of the whole Church. Sir we graunt you this, what exclude you? But what if the whole Church, that is to say, every Christen man and woman (beside the Priest) oftentimes be not disposed to receiue? Shal not the Priest do that he is commanded to do by Christ, and celebrate the memorie of his passion by offering the vnbloody sacrifice of the church, to wit, the body and blood of Christ: which thing when he doth, shall he not receiue? he hath offered: If not, how maketh he his oblation perfect? Thus he about any office of his part, when now will be induced to participate with him, ought to receiue alone, sith in any wise it is to be receiued which he hath offered: rather then to interrupt the

sacrifice of the church is offered by the whole Church: August. De Ciuitate Dei. lib. 10. cap. 20.

Fo. 175. 6

Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11.

D u memorie

memorie of our Lordes Death, which by the Sacrifice to celebrate, is the speciall dutie of a Priest of the New Testament, who is after the order of Melchisedech, to thinsent thankes be alwaies redred to our Loyde, and the benefite of his Death be continued in remembrance.

In 1. Cor
II.

He allegeth a place (as he pretendeth) out of S. Hierome, that of necessitie all should actually receive. Dominica Cœna omnibus debet esse communis. These wordes thus he Englisheth. The Lordes Supper must be Common to all. Then he addeth S. Hieromes reason, quia Dominus omnibus discipulis, qui aderant equaliter tradidit Sacramental because the Lord gaue the Sacramentes equally to al the disciples that were there present. Here he vergeth these wordes, and telleth that they be plaine, equally, and to al the Disciples. Hereupon he concludeth that the Lordes Supper must be common to all.

M. Jewel
allegeth a
vknower
writer vn
der the
of S. Hier
rome.

To al this may be saide, first that these wordes be not S. Hieromes. That those bryefe Commentaries vpon al the Epistles of S. Paule be not his, both the censure of Erasmus witnesseth, and the thing it selfe speaketh. There be probable coniectures they were wryten by some Helagian. Little becommeth it M. Jewel of al men, to allege bastard wryters for true & allowed Doctours, who is so peremptory in disallowing Doctours him selfe, and useth the refection and condemnation of so many Doctours for his chiefe defence. Then if the saying were allowed for S. Hieromes, yet M. Jewel may iustly be required to reuoke hys false translation. For the wordes repoynt not, that our Lordes Supper must be common to al: but that it ought to be common to al. Your word importeth a necessitie, S. Hieromes word importeth but a dutie. And I denye not but so it ought to be, and so it is common to al. For where it is denied to none, that without damnation may receive it, and desireth.

Our lordes
supper is
common to
all.

stretch the same: it may right well seme to be common to al. But M. Jewel would bring the mater so to an absolute necessitie (as it appereth by his translation (must (for) ought) that if the Sacrament be not receined of al, it be not in remembrance of Chyistes Death offered at al. And so bicause he is well assured, that hard, and moze then unlikely it is, to bring al the people to receine together: he would cōclud, that vntil that be brought to passe, we haue no Sacrifice of the Masse, as hath alwayes ben accustomed in Chyistes Church. wherein he sheweth him selfe a diligent seruant of Antichrist, who as Daniel prophecieth, at his coming for a time shal abolish that euer continuing Sacrifice.

Dan 12.

But Sir, if you be so hote in this mater, and wil abide by it, that the Lordes Supper must nedes be common to all; that is, that al receiue it, so oft as we celebrate the memoys of Chyistes death: how comureth it to passe, that among you so Euangelical, seuer professors of the Gospel, and so exact reformers of the Church, which in your iudgement hath ben deformed these thousand yeares vntil of late dayes, that frier Martin Luther the man of God came to lighte our darknes, (how is it I say) that among you there be so many new Communiōns laid and song, wherof of your owne sect, yea of the hottest Sacramentaries so few receiue?

Among
I hote God
pellers all
do not re-
ceiue the
Sacrament
at euery of
their minis-
trations.

After that the first heate of your sudden deuotion was cooled, was not order by you taken, & whereas I say people were weary of it, Priestes, Deacons, and Clerkes should be partakers of your the Lordes Supper, or els be punished? Then was it not brought to a mater of the holy lose, & conuulsed, they should resort to your Supper by course of houses? At length was not your Supper little set by, and almost altogether lothed? In the Cathedral Church of Sarisbury, where you take vpon you more the you are duly called vnto, how is it M. Jewel: do al I praye

there:

A Reioindre to

there come to your Lordes Supper? Nay, can you get them to come vnto it once in a month, or once in a quarter of a Yeare, though you ring the great Bel out neuer so longe? I doubt not but within fewe yeares, wee shall see it shunned and forsaken altogether. Yet as ye vse it, it is no great paine for the people to come from their worldely busines to eate a piece of Bready, and drinke a draught of wine for your sakes, for your wil and Doctrine is, that more be not made of it. This being so, with what face make ye so much a doo for the necessitye of the whole Peoples receiuing together? Why urge you S. Hieromes pretended wordes so much, *Equally*, and to all the Disciples?

This may serue for Answer, in case Dominica Coena, our Lordes Supper, be taken here for the Blessed Sacrament. But I rest more vpon this aunswere, that the Autho^r vnderstoode thereby not the Sacramente of the Altar, but the Feast of common meates made for exercise of Charitie, after the Mysteries had been receiued. Whiche feast was called Agape, which ought to haue been common to all, as wel to the poore, as to the riche. And that is it your Doctor meant, whosoener he be. For the circumstance of the place declareth the same, and euen there mention is made expressely of the Common Supper. Hereof the Reader may finde more in the last Diuision of this Article. It was called Coena Dominica, as there I shal declare. The place of S. Ambrose is likewise to be vnderstanded of the common Suppers, whereat, or rather before whiche, the holy Mysteries were wont to be receaued.

This much haue I saide (Gentle Reader) to M^r. Jewels first Diuision in his treatise of the first Article. which as it seemeth to mee very much in comparison of that he saith in his first Diuision, which is contained in little more then twoo halfe

halfe sydes of his leafe: so am I very loth with like prolixitie to
proceede in confutation of the rest. For so both my labour should
be infinite, and my time is spent, and the reading thereof to o-
thers neither profitable, nor pleasaunt. For as by this begin-
ning thou maist perceaue, that hitherto he hath ministered no
mater of substance or weight, whereby the Replier may haue
occasion to shewe learning: suche is the rest of his huge booke,
stuffed with many wordes to small purpose, with sundrye
falsitiengs of places, with wrestynges of myne and other
mennes sayynges, to a sense neuer thought vpon, with lyes
and fables, and such other pelfe, rather to be contemned, then
to be answered.

The stuff-
ing of M.
Jewels
booke.

In confutation of this first Diuision I haue giuen thee a
Taste as it were, what effect my labour should come vnto,
if I woulde thoroughly examine euery Sentence, wherein he
swaurneth from reason, truth, and learning. From hence
forth I thinke it better, to passe by thinges of lesse weight, and
state at those thinges, the discussion whereof is of more ne-
cessitie. For better it is with conuenient breuitie to defende
and teach the Truth, then with ouer longe and wearisome
creasles, to withhold the Readers from due consideration of
the truth. Neither let M. Jewell, or any of his syde thinke
or reioyce, what thinges I let passe vntouched, that either I
allowe the same as true, being false, or can not confute: but
that I hadde no list so often to trifle with a trifle, and este-
med more the profite of the mater, then multitude of wordes,
and sought rather in deede to doe good to others, then with
vaine shewe of a huge Volume to craue vulgare praise.

A Reioindre to

The Seconde Diuision.

The con-
tentes of
my words
in the 2.
diuision.

In the Seconde Diuision, as it liketh M. Jewell to diuide his booke and mine, is the conclusion of my former saying, that in respect of the Oblation, and of the Communion, forasmuch as bothe be Publike and Common, we doe not acknowledge any Priuate Masse, but leaue that terme to Luthers Schoole, where it was first diuised, and so termed by Sathan. &c.

M. Jew-
el desen-
deth Lu-
ther and
Satan,

This Conclusion M. Jewell letteth slippe, contenting him selfe with that he saide before, and forthwith leauing me, runneth very fiercelly at Higbinus, Bosius, and Stapplus, whom to wreake his malice vpon, he calleth a Renegate, I rowe be- cause for Truthe sake and saluation of his soule, he for- sooke Luthers wicked Schoole, and came to Chyistes Catho- like Church. Here he defendeth bothe Luther the chiefe Smith of the Schoole of this new founde Gospell, and Sa- than him selfe the Heade Schoolemaister. For he taketh vpon him to tel Sathans tale for him worde by worde, wherwith he imagineth Luther to haue been perswaded to say no more Masse, and commendeth boch Sathan for telling it, and Lu- ther for beleeuing it. He saue (saith M. Jewell) by the Te- stimonie and light of his Conscience, that all vphiche Sathan saide was true, and therefore (vpon Sathans motion) confessed he had offended.

Jewel:

Three
Doctors
toynd in
league a-
gainst the
Masse.
Sathans
tale to Lu-
ther by
M. Jew-
els report.

who seeth not, that considereth the plate, how ferendlye these three Doctors toyne together in league against the Masse, Doctor Jewell, Doctor Luther, and Doctor Sathan? Re- member M. Doctor Luther, saith Doctor Sathan, as Doctor Jewell teacheth him his Lesson, these many years thou hast said Masse, thou hast shewed vp Breade and Wyne to be worshipped as God, and yet now thou knowest it was a Creature, and not God. Thereof soloued Ido- latrie, and thou vvere the cause thereof. Thus farre Doctor Sathan, or rather Doctor Jewell in the person of Doctor Sa- than,

than. Now Doctor Luther agreed with it; straight way bethe
to the Masse, and became a new man, and beganne to set forth the
light of this new Gospel, which Doctor Sathan taught him.
Doctor Jewel commendeth wel both the Maister & the scholar
for it. For Luther (saith he) saw al these things to be true by the testimo-
nie and light of his owne conscience. Lo M. Jewel maketh Sathan
a preacher of truth, whom the Scripture calleth a lyer, and the John. 8.
father of lying, a spreader of light, whom Gods worde maketh
Prince of darkenesse. Is it not likely, that this Masse is an il thing, Ephes. 6.
sith that Doctor Sathan preached to his Soune Luther so much
against it? wel, M. Jewel saith al was true, soortheth the De-
vils tale, and to turneth him selfe to his side. Thus by these three
Doctors we are taught to abandon the Masse.

But would not a wise man thinke, that Sathan in this case
had but a simple wittre, & was nothing so crafty, as we at bozne
in hand he is? For if Luther by taking Masse did commit Idolat-
rie, and caused others to do the same, as M. Jewel on Sathans
behalfre reporteth: what a simple and foolish Devil was he, to
withdraw him selfe it, and to perswade him to the contrarie? Can
he haue any thing done by man, that liketh him better then Idol-
latrie? But M. Jewel making a commentarie upon the Devils
Sermon, saith, that the Devils purpose was to leade Luther to
despaire. A man would marvel, how he should be so inward
with that Devil, as to know his purpose. What is he of his
pryncy counsell, that he vnderstandeth so much of his secretest? Is
he be; Gods people haue good cause to beware of him. And is
it to be thought, that the Devil had rather dyne Luther alone to
despaire, then kepe both him, and through him so greate multi-
tudes of Christian people in Idolatrie? we may be sure his wit
is not so simple, as to make so foolish a bargaine.

Of al this it foloweth, that as M. Jewel, both in his
Sermon

M. Jew.
maketh
Satan to
bedeery him
etc in this
case.

M. Jew.
is pryncy to
the Devils
purpose.

in the an-
swer to
my conclu-
sion in the
third syde
second line
et.

sermon at Pauls Crosse, and in sundry places of his booke; labo-
eth to my charge. (though utterly and without cause) that I
haue moued priuat Masse by women, babes, children, laicmen,
madmen, &c. so I may iustly and truly say to his, & his felowes
charge, that they haue abandoned the Masse, and professe enemi-
tie against the Masse, with Sathan. To whether part more
credite is to be geuen, I trust the very simplest of the people,
whom they make iudges of their doctrine, may easily conceiue.

¶ Iew.
compareth
Luthers
conference
with the
Duel, &
temptations
of Christ.
St. Paule
and other
Saintes.
Mar. 4.

1. Cor. 12.

Because it seemeth to al men a strange matter, and a thing
that enery good christian man blesseth him selfe from, one thus
to be schooled of the Deuil, and to haue conference with Sathan,
least for that very cause the Masse of al good folke should be the
better esteemed: ¶ Iewel casteth a colour vpon it, that it might
seem lesse daunous by alleging the examples of Christ, whom
the Deuil was permitted to carie vp into an high mount, of St.
Paule, who had the angel of Sathan to buffet him, and of my
puruise Saintes (so it becommeth Sathans frende to scoffe at
Gods frendes the Saintes.) vpon whose Legendes as he saith, are full of
visions of Devils. In dede this might seme to serue somewhat in
defence of Sathans schooling of Luther against the Masse, which
matter ¶ Iewel goeth about to defend, if he could shewe, that
either Christ or St. Paule, or any of the blessed Martyrs, Confes-
sours, and virgins, (the memories of whose martyrdomes and
holy liues in our Breviaries or Portuifles are set forth) euer pee-
led and gaue place vnto the Devils persuasions contrary to any
article of our faith, as Luther dyd; who after that lesson taught
him by Sathan, neuer worshipped the body and blood of Christ,
wherein ¶ Iewel foloweth him, though he acknowledged, and
fought against the Sacramentaries defended, the same in the
blessed Sacrament to be really present, wherein ¶ Iewel as
all other the Sacramentaries, is at defiance with him.

As for visions of Devils, wherewith Saintes have ben troubled, and vexed by Gods permission for their exercise, for that behalfe he hath no greater cause to scosse at Legendes of Saintes mentioned in my Booke, then at the life of S. Antony written by S. Athanasius, and of holy Hilarton writen by S. Hierome, and sundry writings of other auncest fathers of most estimation, in whom not seldome is expresse mention made of such visions.

Visions of Devils permitted by God to the exercise of his Saintes.

The Third Division.

In the third Division I graunt unto M. Jewell, that the name of private Masse is sometimes found in certain ancient Councils, in S. Thomas, & in other Schole Doctors but not in that sense in which Luther with his Scholers calleth it private, but only as it is different from publick and solemne, in consideration of time, place, and other circumstances. For proufe thereof authoritie be alleged in the margin.

The contents of the 3. Division.

This is very true, as neither M. Jewell himselfe, nor any learned man can denie. Yet least he should say nothing to it, he saith much to no purpose, neither prayeth the contrary of what he saith. And herein I challenge him, & tel him that reason would he should haue disprooued my saying, or not haue reprobued it at all. Therefore he sheweth a disease of his mynd more then any learning.

The wordes of S. Thomas be cleere, which M. Jewell the better to wrest them to his purpose, somedeale falsifieth. For hauing graunted that at the solemne celebration of Masse, moe ought to be present for seruing the priest, as in high feastes, and when a Bysshop doth celebrat with solemnitie, confirming the same by an old decre of Saint Peter the Pope: he saith thus. In Missis tamen privatis sufficit vnum habere

E. 4. ministrum,

ministrum, qui gerit personam totius populi Catholici, ex cuius persona sacerdoti pluraliter respondet. Neuerthelesse in private Masses, it is sufficient to haue but one Minister, who beareth the person of the whole Catholike people, in whose person he answereth the Priest, plurally. In whiche place this wordc tamen, that is to say, neuerthelesse, sufficiently admonished M^r. Jewel (but that he setled him selfe to wrangle) that somewhat was spoken by way of renocation contrary, or at least different, to that whereof mention was made before, which is Solemne Masse, whereat it is required that no then one minister attend vpon the Priest, but at a private masse, it is ynough there be but one to minister vnto the Priest, for thereto be S. Thomas words to be referred, and not onely to the presence of persons, as by M^r. Jewels falsifying they be. By this place it appeareth plainly, that in S. Thomas Masse is sometimes called private, in respect of Solemne, and not onely of that the Priest receiveth the blessed Sacrament without companie, as M^r. Jewel would it to seeme, which is that I affirmed, and stil do affirme.

M. Jew.
falsifieth
S. Tho-
mas by lea-
ving out
Tamen,
whiche
here speci-
ally per-
taineth to
the pointe.

The. 16.
vnto the
he acknow-
legeth no
errours in
the Masse

In con-
trouer-
sies
Missis pri-
uatis, co-
trouerfia
sexta.

M^r. Jewel in his first Paragraphe of this. 3. Division, saith in spite of vs, that Albertus Maginus (whom he would faine make vile and contemptible by a light corrupting of the Orthographie of his name, not being able to disprove his doctrine) *acknowlegeth abuses and errours in the Masse. For trial of this, by the note in the Margent he referreth the reader to the place. But reade Maginus in that place who list, or els where: and he shall finde no errours by him therein acknowledged. This therefore is a manifest lye. yet is this one of M^r. Jewels chiefe common places against the Catholiks. This hath he often times made the Pulpites to ring of, this hath he once or twice in his Challenging Sermons, so much & by so many now evidently confuted. This is thundred out diuers times in the lying Apologie.

Now

Now as errors which he acknowledgeth none to be in the Masse, so he complaineth of certaine abuses, that be crept into that most holy Service, giving warning withal, to what man, and to what men the correction thereof belongeth. Touching these abuses, what manner ones we may thinke them to be, I have sufficiently declared in my Confutation of the Apologie. Thither for answer hereto I referre the Reader.

In the fourth part. fol. 146. b. c.

In the last Paragraphe of this Division, M. Jewel at length cometh to agree with us for the term Masse, although it be very seldom, as he saith, and almost neuer founde in the olde Catholike writers, the contrary wherof it is easy to shewe out of S. Ambrose, S. Leo, and certaine auncient Fathers neare to the Apostles age, which if occasion so require, shal be done hereafter. Now is M. Jewel content speaking in the person of his Brethren, to call that the Common or Publike Masse, whereas the Priest and people receiue the holy Communion together, which was, saith he, the auncient order of the Apostles and Holy Fathers in the Primitive Church. wel mer, M. Jewel. I trust we shal be better acquainted with you & your fellowes. For if ye will abide by that ye say here, ye will no more raise and barke at us your pooze persecuted countrie men of Conscience, as ye haue this long time done, for saying and hearing Masse: seeing that in these partes, very often times and commonly, we with the people, and the Priestes and people, receiue the holy Communion together. If that be the matter, for which ye can be content to heare the Masse named, there is no iust cause why ye should so much abhorre us, and the name of the Masse hereafter.

The. 17. vnto. It is oft founde in the olde writers as it shall appeare hereafter, in the 5. Division. M. Jew. confesseth e acknowledgeth a Masse.

I am glad we haue wonne so much of you, that your selfe confesse there was a Masse in the Primitive Church. For if that be as it is by your owne graunt, a publike Masse, where the Priest and people receiue the Communion together, and the same was vsed by order of the Apostles and holy Fathers in the

Masse graunted to haue been in the Primitive Church.

A Reioindre to

Primitive Church: the publike Masse being a Masse, here of it followeth necessarily, that the Apostles and the holy Fathers had Masse in the Primitive Church.

But Sir, you will say perhaps, we haue not gained much at your handes, seeing that you graunt vs no more, but that to be called a publike Masse, vvhether the Priest and People receiue the holy Communion together. In deede al dependeth vpon your meaning, which because we know not what it is, neither can we be certaine what ye graunt, more then the bare name of the Masse. If in your definition you referre your worde *Vvhether*, to the whole auncient order of the Masse of olde time vsed in the Catholike Church, then as you call that a Masse which we do: so you vary from vs in that you make the receiuing of the People so to be of the necessitie of the Masse, as without that, there be none at al, but a private Masse as you terme it, which in no wise you can allowe. But if you meane by your worde *vvhether*, the whole newe deuise of your Communion, we can not though ye woulde neuer so faine, suffer that to be called a Masse.

Neither knowe we well what you meane by your *the holy Communion*, which being receiued of the people with the Priest, al that is there done, you seme to call the Masse. If you meane by your holy Communion the peoples eating of bread, and drinking of wine together with the Priest (for more your selfe would it not to be) the Body and Blood of our Lorde by no vertue of the mystical blessing or due consecration really made present: as that onely we do not acknowledge to be the true and holy communion of our Lords Body and Blood, but rather a prophanation of the same, though you sende vp your spirit to heauen, and there feede on Christe by your faith, and imagination neuer so greedily: so much lesse doo we acknowledge it to be the Masse.

Let

*Q. New.
holy Com-
munion a
terme vn-
certaine.*

Let vs I pray you M. Jewel set al contention aside, and seeke the truth with the feare of God, and so by preaching and writing deliuer it to y^e people, as we may geue God an accompt in that great daye.

In the Eucharist (the mat^r being so much spoken of the word may now be admitted) certaine we are by most clere and plaine wordes of the Gospel, how stubbonly soeuer the Sacramentaries denye it, first that there is the very true body of our Saviour Christ, which I proue in the fifth Article, and now is very sufficiently proued by Doctor Sammers learned treatise: next, that it is there as a Sacrifice, as it was in the supper by Christs institution, which I proue in the .17. Article, and also as a Sacrament, which is by al the learned Fathers agreed vpon. As it is a Sacrament, it is receiued, as it is a Sacrifice; first it is offered, and afterward eaten. Christe at his supper by signes and outward tokens gaue signification of a Sacrifice. For he toke the Bread into his handes, he gaue thanks, he blessed it, and brake it. &c.

The Eucharist is a Sacrament and a Sacrifice

Mat. 26.
Luc. 22.

Now whereas you M. Jewel and the rest of your side, doe receiue the Eucharist, and do not also offer it, ye celebrate an eating and drinking, and make a supper of y^e Lorde (I meane after your manner) the Sacrifice of the Crosse ye make not. And so hath Bucer him selfe one of your chiefe Doctours confessed with these wordes. In nostra eucharistia mors Christi tantū verbis, non etiam symbolis pradicatur. In our Eucharist (saith he) y^e death of Christ is preached or set forth only by wordes, & not by signes. wherfore your eucharist, in which there is no signe nor toke of an external sacrifice, is not y^e Christian Eucharist. For Christ commaunded vs not to saye these things in remembraunce of him, but to do or make. Do ye (or make ye) this in my remembrance, Therefore in the mysteries the hoste or Sacrifice of Christe is not to be sayde or spoken onely, but also to be done or made. And heereof it followeth that the memoie of Christs Sacrifice

The Gospelers in their supper celebrate an eating and drinking, they celebrate not the Sacrifice.

Bucer. lib. 2. de vera & falsa dominica cena administratione.
Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11.

A Reioindre to

Sacrifice be to be represented at the altar by signes and tokens such as Chyiste at his Supper vsed, and not only by wordes: Els if there be an eating, and not an Oblation: there shalbe a sampler and image of the Supper, but sampler and image of the Sacrifice, there shalbe none at al.

Thus it is euident how ye abuse the holy Eucharist, and how ye bryake and mangle the Institution of Chyiste. And as your the Lordes Supper is not only not our Lords true Supper for lacke of the speciall meate our Lords very body, hauing by your doctrine but only symbolical bread and wyne: so in the Eucharist of the Catholike Church, I meane in the holy Masse, the true body of Chyiste being first consecrated by the almighty power of the word, and so offered by the Pryest to God in a Sacramēt vnbloody, in remembrance of that bloody Sacrifice offered vpon the Crosse: we do celebrate both the memoie of his Sacrifice, by which our sinnes are remitted, and also of the Supper. which Supper if the people at any tyme do not dispose them selfe worthily to receiue with the Pryeste, for the same is he neither to be blamed, being desirous they examined and made them selues ready thereto, nor for that cause ought he to be debarred from celebrating Masse, wherein he may do that thing, which Chyiste commaunded Pryests to do, saying, Do ye this in my remembrance.

Luc. 22.

The Fourth Division.

In the Fourth Division M. Jetwell answereth me reproving him for that he shunned the accustomed name of Passion Sunday, chosing rather to call that day in the title of his Challenge, the Sunday before Easter, which thing as it is not of great weight, so his answer to it is of

of smal reason. *What* (saith he very hotely) *thinkst he that all* Jewel. *folke are Heretikes, that name the daies otherwise, then they be named in his Portuise?*

You haue great spite at my Portuise M. Jewel, and so hath Portuise the Devil too, I doubt not. I am as litle a shained of my Portuise, or of any other order of prayer appointed by the Church of God, as you are busy to deface prayer, fasting, christia discipline, and al other good incanes to bying the people to vertuous living. It is not my Portuise only that nameth that day *Passion* on Sunday, but al Christen people of the west Church, in which *Sunday.* you are borne, specially they of your Countrie. And to deuise new termes in religion, you knowe, it hath euer ben taken for a note of heretikes. I condemne neither you, nor others, as heretikes for this point, as you charge me: but for such affectation of noueltie, and for refusing the auncient name of the day vied in the Catholike Church, I note you as being of assinitie to them, and as one that beareth them good fauour.

Neither do I hereby condemne the Grekes, who for ought that you knowe to the contrary, may haue that name of the day in their Calender, or in their common vse of speaking. Though the day of Parascue be of vs Englishmen called Good Friday, and likewise of other nations in Christendom, yet I do not condemn them, as you surmise. But if any Englishman would vpon a newe evangelical spirite shunne the vsual terme of Good Friday, and call it only by the Greke terme Parascue in an English Sermon: if I called him a newe fangled foole for it, I thinke I should not greatly offend any wise man thereby. *Good Friday.*

But the Italians (saith M. Jewel) contrary to the Portuise, call Jewel. the first weeke in Lent the Carnuale, and then I should condemne them also. Wert I am soe charged with one, that sheweth as great skill in the Italian tongue, as in the Grekes Calender.

A Reioindre to

**Carne-
uale.**

Twisse the Italians call not the first weeke in Lent, Carneuale, at which time both the name and pastetime of Carneuale is passed and gone: but the time of certaine weekes before the first weeke in Lent. And that could not be haue ben ignorant of, if euer he had ben in Italie in that part of the yere. Now he sheweth how litle he feareth to auouch thinges for truth, which he knoweth not.

He acknowlegeeth that day to be called in the Portuise also the Sonday Iudica, and that name to be as catholike, as Passion Sonday. True it is, yet vsed he neither of them both, and if that day had fine names moe, and euery one were appointed by the catholike church: he would rather deuise a newe of his owne head, then to be sene to vse any one of them.

Jewel.

1. Cor. 11.

In the ende of this Diuision, he praiseth much his vsing of the pulpit with sobrietie, and saith, *he speaks of the abuses of Christes last supper, hauing occasion thereto of these vvordes of S. Paule. The thing that I receiued of the Lorde, the same haue I deliuered vnto you, vvho in his time seemeth to finde faulte vvith the Corinthians for the same.*

**Of the
Churche
feastes me-
tioned by
S. Paule
to the Co-
rinthians.**

That place of S. Paule **Jewel** both in his Challenge, and in his Replie, sundry times abuseth much to the deceite of the people, wherein he followeth Peter Martyr, as in many other false pointes. S. Paule in that place syndeth not faulte with the Corinthians for the abuse of the blessed Sacrament directly, either concerning the Administration of it, or the receiuing: but for that they abused their Church feastinges, whereto, or immediately before which, they receiued also the Sacrament. For whereas in those feastes, which the fathers called *ἀγῶνας*, they should haue shewed the fruites of vnitie, when they had now receiued the mysterie of vnitie: contrariwise they shewed schisme, and dissension. Likewise for charitie, humilitie, meeknesse, moderati-

on,

on, indifferencie towardes al, and other vertues, requisite to such holy bankets made in the church to the imitation and example of Christe, for which that kinde of feasting, was called Dominica coena, our Lordes supper, euen of S. Paule in that Epistle after the minde of S. Ambrose, and of Theophylacte, who therein doubtles foloweth the auncient fathers of y^e Breke church: they shewed spite, pride, disdain, dyckennesse, partialitie in admitting the rich to their table, and reiecting the poore, and sundry other great disorders. For these abuses committed in those Churchfeastes, whereof consequently folowed also the mispilling of the blessed Sacrament, and not for any touching the celebration of that deuine mysterie specially, S. Paule rebuked the Corinthians, But heretofore Jewell geueth me occasion to speake moze hereafter in his. s. and in his last Division.

In comment.
in

1. Cor. 11.

The abuses
of the
Church
feastes.

After this he would faine proue, that the supper of Christe (so he calleth the Sacrament) may be abused. Therto he allegeth once againe Albertus Pighius de priuata Missa, and sicketh not to say, this appeareth to be true by the very confession of their aduersaries (meaning the Catholikes,) and that they deny not, but that these be abuses and errours copen into the Priuate Masse. What Pighius hereof hath writen, I shewed in the Division before this. Merely he acknowlegeth no errours to be in the Masse. This manifest vnt ruth can not by any meanes be excused or coloured, yet hath he twise made it within the compasse of fewe lines. Thanked be our Lorde, that the enemies of his Sacrifice can not impugne it, but with euident lyes, whereby they do the world to understand, how litle credite in doctrine of faith they deserue. What abuses Pighius complaineth of as copen into the seruice of the Masse, I haue truly declared in my Confutation of their English churchs Apologie, as is aboue noted.

Jewel.

I manifest
the of
the
offences
reported.

Fol. 106.

F. J. Jewell

A Reioindre to

The fifth Diuision.

In the 5. Diuision M. Jewel hath laid together a great parcel of my answer to his first Article. To disproue the same he hath heaped together a farre greater parcel of stufte such as it is. From which who so euer shal take away suche superfluous talke, byc maters not pertaining to the point there treated, falsifyinges of Doctours, and specially a number of lies, which are the chiefe stuffing of his huge booke: he shal leaue very litle besides worth the reading.

The contents of
M. Jewels
Reple in
the 5. di-
uision.
Dan. 6. 12.

First he maketh his entrie with a solemne prayer protestant-like, as if he were about to make a Sermon, and his sauourable hearers ready to sing a song. Then he accuseth chinsammation of my choler, because alluding to the wordes of Daniel, I glaunched at the name of the forerunners of Antichriste, therewith rubbing him and his holy companions, as it were on their gaul, for the Devilish spire they shewe to the blessed sacrifice of Christe mystically represented, and truly conuiewed in the daily sacrifice of the Church, now called the Masse. At length hauing with his Euangelical meeknesse compared my spirite with the spirite of those Pharisees, who stirred the Jewes to stone S. Steuen, and charged Christe with blasphemie uttered against God: full coldely and demurely he promisseth, that he wyl not answerre beate vwith beate, but in that kinde of eloquence wyl geue place, doing much like to one that crieth truce, after he hath geuen a stroke. which promise how wel he hath kept through his whole Reple, they can wel iudge, who like not to bestow the time so euill, as to reade it ouer.

Act. 7.
Mat. 26.

After this by a short Preface pretending to loyn eclose with me, and to touch the mater, toward the which he made so great a

pre-

preparation: he runneth out farre from the purpose & my words import, to S. Gregories rebuking of Iohn the Archebishop of Constantinople, for his ambitious and vniuersall claiming of the name of Vniuersal Bishop, and there he hath by his common pulpite bible bable, of the forerunner of Antichriste, of Lucifer, of his vaunting him selfe above his brethren, and of, I can not tel what. This place of S. Gregorie, and that of Bishius, where he complaineth of abuses crept into the Masse, he two of M. Iewels storehouses, out of which commonly he stoereth him selfe with multitude of wordes, when he is destitute of good matter.

The matter of Vniuersal Bishop, because I haue already thereof treated in my Confutation of their Apologie, and occasion is geuen thereof to speake hereafter, and specially because it pertaineth not to our present purpose: I thinke good with silence to passe ouer.

Being charged with false doctrine against the mystical, sacramental, and unbloudy Sacrifice of the Church, wherein that very body that was once offered on the Crosse with shedding of blood, and with sensible breaching forth of his inuestigable members, is now without bloud shedding, and besides this manner also offered in a sacrament, and in a mystrie: he saith much of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, whereof is no question made, and of the Sacrifice of the altar, he speaketh neuer a word. As though by saying good of that, he should be borne withal for denying this.

Where he speaketh of a Sacrifice made by man, what he meaneth, wel I knowe not. If by that worde he minded to be-
ter some parte of his spite against the blessed Sacrifice of the Masse, vnderstand he, which he is not ignorant of, that sacrifice is not made by man, as the author and institour of it, but by our Saviour Iesus Christ him selfe, who at his last supper first in-

f u

situted.

Ad const
tiam Au-
gust. lib. 4.
epist. 78. ad
Mauritiu
Imp. lib. 7.
epist. 197.
Two of
M. Iewels
store boxes
es.

Fol. 55. a.
Item.

Fol. 204. a.

How the
sacrifice is
made by
man.

A Reioindre to

Luc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

stituted it, commending the Apostles, who he the created Priests, and in the charge committed to them & their successors, to do and offer the same in remembrance of him. And for this commendement of Christe, it is made and done by man, as minister, not as authour. Neither is this an other Sacrifice, as he pretendeth. It is the same that was offered upon the crosse, there is no difference between this and that concerning the thing offered, the difference or diuersitie is only in the manner of offering. This much must we oftentimes repeat, yet these men make awise, as though it had neuer ben tolde them.

The Sac-
rifice of
the Church
is
commonly
called the
Masse.

He maketh much ado with me, for that speaking of the Sacrifice of the Church, I said it to be commonly called the Masse. For these holy folke would saue, if they wist how, abolish not only the most blessed and healthful Sacrifice of the Masse, but also the very name of the Masse. Satan and they in no wise can abide it.

But say I reposit me to al the worlde, is it not in dede commonly called the Masse? Is it not so called in England, Scotland, Ireland, Fraunce, Germanie, Pole, Hungarie, Spain, Italye, by all Christendome ouer, where so euer the Latine speech is knowen? what means you to denie a thing so euident?

Iewel.

O you say, that neither the Hebrues in their tongue, nor the Greekes in their tongue, nor Christe, nor his Apostles, nor Tertullian, nor S. Cyprian, nor Origen, nor Lactantius, nor S. Hierome, nor S. Augustine, nor S. Clement, nor Abdiar, nor Hippolytus in their bookes euer vsed the name of the Masse.

But what if I graunted you al this? what conclude you thereof? If the name of the Masse be not founde in the Bible, (wherein if one would stand with you, he might saye more for the affirmatiue, neither without auctoritie of very wel learned men, then you should be hable to refel) nor in the Scripture, nor in the sayings of Christe, or his Apostles, nor in the writings

ringes of Tertullian, S. Cyprian, Origen, Lactantius, and of
the rest which you reckon: may it not yet be founde in others?
Will you neuer leane that pernicious kinde of Argument deduced
of negatives, or, ab autoritate negative, as they terme it in
schooles? what if neither I, nor any of vs here in Louaine,
nor any other Catholike, or wise man wil cal you A bishop:
wil you not repleye for all that, and say, that so many the right
reuerent fathers, your owne companions (fathers they be in
dede) do commonly so call you? I make the comparison to
shewe the weaknesse of thargument only, for touching the
truth of thinges, be you neuer so much named bishop of Saris-
burie, certaine it is, you are none, as none other of your order
is. what if the Citie of Yorke be not so named in Hebrue,
Greke, by Christe, the Apostles, Tertullian, Lactantius, nor by
any other that euer wrote in Greke or Latine, but Eboracum,
which is farre from the sound of Yorke: shal we thereof conclude
that it is not commonly called Yorke?

If Missa be a Latine worde, as I beleue it is: what reason
haue you against that it is so commonly called, out of Hebrue or
Greke? Shall we not saye that bread is commonly called bread,
because that worde is not founde in Hebrue, Greke, or Latine?
Remember M. Jewell, you are borne in the Latine Church.
You ought not to humne the names of thinges thereof, because
you finde not them so named in the Hebrue tongue, or Greke
wryters.

Seeing that you dygne me to shewe some antiquitie of the
name Missa, I fynde it recorded and mencioned by auncient Fa-
thers of good auctoritie, euen within the compasse of your first
six hundred yeres, whose auctoritie not without preiudice of
the thousand yeres following, and of Christes promise of the

29. Yew.
commonly
deduceth
his argu-
mentes of
negatives

The name
Missa
founde in
sundry old
wryters,
and Cate-
chists.
John. 14.

A Reioindre to

Ambrosi.
Epist. 33. holp ghostes remaining with the church for ever, you seeme to allowe. S. Ambrose hath the expresse word *Missam*, in an Epistle, that he wrote to the noble woman *Marcella* his sister. *Missam facere corpi*, that is, I beganne Masse, be his very wordes.

Seuerus Sulpitius a learned man of that age, in the life of S. *Marine* speaketh expressely of Masse, and nameth *Missarum solennia*, as much to say, as *solemn Masse*. The worde is oftentimes used of the auncient fathers in the plural number, because before al the people were come to the faith, that which now we call the Masse, was then divided into two, wherof the one was the Masse of the Catechumens, who were novices and learners of the faith before they were admitted to baptism, the other was the Masse of the perfite beleuers.

Missam Catechumenorum, & Missam perfectorum. S. Leo that learned and eloquent bishop, writing to *Dioscorus* bishop of Alexandria, speaketh of the Masse by name. whose plaine worde Masse, S. Jewel in the Sermon of his Challenge, turneth into ministring of the communis, putting Leo to scholl as it were, and teaching him how to use his termes minister-like. Victor maketh expresse mention of Masse.

Epist. 81. Leaving out S. Alexander Pope and Charrys, nye to the Apostolikes age, and certaine other popes, Charrys, and holy Confessours of very great auncientie, who in their writings haue made mention of the Masse by name, because these felowes with more stubbornesse refuse their witnessses, then with reason are hable to disprove them: I wil now come to certaine Councils, every one of good Authority, and holden by learned and holy bishops within S. Jewels six hundred yeres.

Lib. 2. de persecuti-
one Vandalorum. It was decreed by the fathers of the second Council of Carthage, which was holden in the yere of our Lord. 407. after the computation of *Marianus Scotus*, *reconciliare quonquam in publica Missa presbytero non licere*, that it should not be lawfull for a priest to re-

The word
Missam
founde in
auncient
Councils.
Cocilyum
Carthagi-
nen. 2.
can. 3.

concile

concile any man in Publike Masse.

In an Aphrican Councel holden at Agilentum, where S. Augustine was present, it was ordeined, that such order of church Service, as Prayers, Masses, Prefaces, Commendations, &c. should be vsed of al, which was approued by a Councel, and none other, where the worde Masse, is expresse.

Can. 12.

In the Councel of Agatha holden about the yere of our Lorde. 400. it was permitted to men dwelling farre from parish Churches, for ease of their families, to builde Oratories or Chappels in their owne groundes, and there to haue Masses. Provided alwayes notwithstanding, that in the High and solene feastes they should resort to y^e towne and Parish Churches, to haue Masse and diuine service. In the same Councel secular folke are commaunded to heare Masse on the Sunday, and not to departe before they receiue the priestes blessing, which is geue at the end of Masse. In two Canons of this ancient Councell the expresse name of Masse is twice founde.

Can. 12.

Can. 47.

At the thirde Councel of Arles in Fraunce, which was kept in the tyme of Marcellian the Emperour farre within S. Iewels hundred yeres, a decree was made, that if any Bishop had pronounced to y^e holy orders of Priesthood or Deaconship any that was in publike penance, that had ben twice married, or had ben the husband of a weddo: he should not presume to celebrate Masse for the space of a whole yere, for so be the wordes of the Canon. Anno integro Missas celebrare non praesumat.

Concil.
Arelaten
Can. 3.

Here might I allego other auncient Councells, as the first at Orleans, the Councel of Nicaea in Spain, the Councel also of Gerunda these, in which the expresse name of Masse is founde.

To the antiquitie of these auncient Councells, I will adde the

B. 1.

antiquitie

Tripar.
hist. lib. 3.
cap. 11. a.
pud So-
zomenū.
lib. 2. cap.
32.

authoritie of Epiphanius Scholasticus, who lived within the
first six hundred yeares, as Hieronimus Pantaleon of Basile a
Doctor of *St. Jewels* owne sect, maketh account: who
translating Sozomenus a Greeke writer, where he speaketh of
certaine that came to Church and hearde Service, turned his
Greeke worde *εὐχαριστία*, into these twoo Latine wordes,
Missas celebrabant, that is, they celebrated Masse. wher-
by he generall witnesseth that in his tyme the name of Masse was
not straunge.

The cause
why I al-
lege testi-
monies for
the worde
Masse.

Thus because *St. Jewel* was so importunate with me, as
to demaunde whye I shewed not of what auncient Fathers
the Sacrifice of the Church is called by the name of Masse,
bearing his saunders in hande, I had none at al to shew:
I have thought it good to allegge such numbze as might seeme
to be sufficient to satisfie any man; that is not peruerfly worded
in *St. Jewels* sayings, be they true be they false, and so be-
lene what so ever is taught by them which professe earnestly and
bitterly against the Catholike Church.

If the auncient authoritie of *S. Ambrose*, of *Gregorius*
Sulpicius, of *S. Leo*, of *Bishop Victor*, of *Epiphanius*
Scholasticus the auncient *Trinitarians*, and of so many la-
ned Fathers of *Italie*, *France*, *Spain*, *Africke*, and of
hundre other Princes assembled together in Councils, the
wordes of whose Canons be wel weyed and examined, before
they be put in writing to stand for Decrees, if al these I saye, be
not ynough to proue the auncient vse of the worde Masse; I
knowe not what can be ynough. Wherby it is euident by these
testimonies, that at those dayes it was called a *Christendom*
ouer, where the Latine tongue was vsed.

wherefore let *St. Jewel* marueil no more, that *Albert*
saye the Sacrifice to be commonly called the Masse. when

When I wrote so, my minde was not directed into antiquities, so much as into the latter age of the Church.

Now cometh M. Jewell to the chiefe point of this fifth Division, wherein as by my wordes it appeared, I gave the diligent Reader a warning, to here to finde authorities for confirmation of his faith, concerning the Blessed Sacrifice of the Church, whether M. Jewell will or no, commonly called the Masse. The authorities I alleged not at length, as they be inserted in their places, for that had been very long, neither fitte to my purpose in that place. I thought best to direct the Reader unto the view of them, where they be. And so much I signifie there. M. Jewell knowing wel ynough the force of those testimonies for the Masse, (so I cal with Christes Church the dayly and unbloudy Sacrifice of the Church) and seeing himselfe not able to aunswere them to the purpose: shiftech his handes of them so wel as his spirit setued him: but with shame ynough, as it wil appeare in the ende. The false and crafty strigthies he doeth, be these.

First, he reckneth together my prouers, as if I had byn best for his purpose, geuing to them all, the name of Doctours, as though the Masse had no ground of Scripture. whereas in my booke with due distinction, first I alleged Scripture, then Doctours. For prouer of the Masse I referre the Reader to the figure of Melchisedech, to the Prophecie of Malachias, to the Institution of Christ, from him to the Apostles, from them to the Church, and so to the whole worlde. After this I bring the Reader to the Doctours.

But M. Jewell to auoid the authorities of the thing proued, accompteth Melchisedech the King and Priest, Malachias the Prophecie, Christe our Saviour, and his Apostles, for Doctours of the Church.

1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200

M. Jew.
crafty
deightes,
where ma
ter of suf
ficient an
swere lac
keth.
Gen. 14.

M. Jew:
annobret
Christ, the
Apostles,
Melchised
ech, and
Malachias
as, for
Doctours
of the
Church.

Doctors: who though for some respetto maye so be taken, yet where mention is of ¶ Doctors of the Church, who haue treated of scripture, they are neuer accompted in that order.

what
shutes M
Iewel v-
seth feelig
his parte
to be the
weaker.

After that he hath reckened them by name, he is seth and scooteth at the whole, and maketh merry sport, where the matter requirerth grauitie, like as craspe Slanes in Comedies sometimes shift them selues from their Masters sadde reckonings with a merry toy. And here haue we M. Jewels troupes, ranks, armies, camilados, Minimers, visardes, warlike and Christmas termes, for sport mingled together. Then for shewe of some answer to Melchisedech, Malachias, and the Institution of Christ, he maketh a ridiculous argument as on my behalfe, scottingly concluding for private Masse, whereas I alleged them not for praufe of private Masse, but of the Sacrifice of the Masse in general.

Lastly he denyeth some Doctors whom I alleged, and finderth fault with their authoritie vpon light reasons, and false surmises, the more and better numbre of them he dessembleth, & answereth the point with silence touching them, and with many wordes vnnecessary touching things to the state of the present question impertinent. And thus in effect he dischargeth himselfe of the matter, which with reason, or any due colour of truth, he can neuer answer. But the weight of the matter is not with such light and slender leauers carryed away. Concerning therefore M. Jewels light scootes, let vs weigh the graue authoritie both of the Scriptures, and of the holy and Learned Fathers.

Sacrifice
how it is
diuersly
taken.

My purpose being to moue that we haue a Sacrifice in the Church, which is done, offered, & celebrated in ¶ Masse: to this intent ¶ matter maye the better be vnderstanded, I require two things to be remembred, that the name of Sacrifice, is taken sometime for

for the thing which is offered unto God, sometime for the acte it selfe of offering. For the thing it selfe, as where S. Paule saith, writing in his Epistle to the Hebrewes: Euery Byshop Heb. 5. is ordained to offer giftes and Sacrifices for sinnes. For the acte, as where Jonathan to excuse Dauids absence from king Saules table, saide, that he was at a solemne Sacrifice of his familie in their owne Towne. So Cicero taketh the worde, where he saith, Præbere hostias ad Sacrificium. To giue hosties to sacrifice. So are the wordes artificium, latificium; and other the like of Learned men vied.

The other thing to be remembered is, that as the Catholikes do speake of the Sacrament of the Altar two wayes, so also of the Sacrifice of the Altar two wayes. For it is a Sacrament onely, to witte, the outward formes of Breade and wyne, which do contayne in them the body and bloude of Chyrist: It is also the thing and the Sacrament, that is to saye, the Body and Bloud of Chyrist in and vnder the outward formes conteyned. Likewise in the Oblation of the Church of Masse, there is an outward Sacrifice of the forms of bread and wine, which S. Augustine writing vpon the psalms, calleth the Sacrifice of bread and wine. There is also an inward Sacrifice, or a Sacrifice of inward things; to witte, of the body and bloud of Chyrist, which we offer vnto God in our Masse vnder those formes.

Sacra-
ment, and
Sacrifice
taken two
wayes.

in psal. 137

This much being said, let vs come vnto the places in my Answer alleged out of the olde Testament for proufe of our Sacrifice in the Masse. This is certain, that Melchisedech was a Priest, for he was the Priest of the highest God, saith the scripture. If he were a Priest, then he offered Sacrifice vnto God. For euery Priest is ordained to offer Sacrifice. But we sde not that euer he offered any other Sacrifice, then Breade and wine, wherefore

Gen. 14.

Heb. 5.

A Reioindre to

wherefore seeing that after the same manner and order we offer
 up the formes of bread and wine, it foloweth that we offer Sa-
 crifice, verely and in dede. But where Melchisedech offered
 Breade and wyne onely, we by the commaundement of Christ
 and after the example of Christe, whose figure Melchisedech
 bare, and who ordained Priestes at his last Supper, which
 Priesthood doth continue after the order of Melchisedech for e-
 uer: we I saye, do offer up vnder the forme of Breade and
 wine, the Body and Bloude of Christe, into which the bread
 and wine by thalmighty power of Christes woorde are really
 turned, for so him selfe said, This is my Body, this is my blood.
 Do this in my remembrance. And this Oblation of the Body
 and Bloud of Christe vnto God at the Altar, is the Oblation
 and Sacrifice of the newe Testament, dayly offered by Priestes
 in the Sacrifice of the Church, which we call the Masse, or the
 Sacrifice of the Masse.

Thus to vnderstande the figure of Melchisedech, and to
 thinke the Sacrifice of the Church thereby proued, we are taught
 by the Blessed Martyr S. Cyprian, who wryting to Cæcilius,
 speaketh largely hereof, and among many other sayings he
 hath this. In Sacerdote Melchisedech Sacrificij dominici Sa-
 cramentum præfiguratum videmus, &c. In the Priest Melchise-
 dech we see the Sacrament of our Lords Sacrifice præfigured, ac-
 cording to that the holy Scripture witnesseth and saith: Melchise-
 dech King of Salem brought forth breade and wyne: for he was
 the Priest of the highest God, and he blessed Abraham. And
 that Melchisedech bare the figure of Christ, the holy Ghost de-
 clareth in the Psalmes speaking to the Sonne in the person of the
 Father: before the morning sterre I begote thee. The Lord hath
 sworne, and shall not repent him of it; Thou arte a Priest for euer
 after the order of Melchisedech. Which order is euery where here
 comming

The Sa-
 crifice of
 the Church.

Mat. 26.
 Luc. 22.

Lib. 2.
 Epist. 3.

Gen. 14.

Psal. 109.

comming of that Sacrifice and descending from thence, that Melchisedech was the Priest of God the highest, that he offered breade and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is more the Priest of God the highest then our Lorde Iesus Christ, which offered Sacrifice to God his Father? And offered the very same that Melchisedech offered, bread and wyne, to witte, his Body and Bloud. Thus saith S. Cyprian. who expressly saith the order of Melchisedech to be here on Earth euery where descending from that Sacrifice, because he offered Bread and wine, the type and figure of the Sacrifice of the Church, that now is offered by Priestes of the New Testament ouer all the worlde, and to declare what Breade and wyne it is, he sayth, the Body and Bloude of Christe.

S. Augustine writing upon the psalmes allegeth this figure of Melchisedech for the Sacrifice of Christ. Before the kingdom of his Father (saith he) he changed his countenance, and he let him go, and he went away, because he was there after the order of Aaron. And afterwarde he instituted a Sacrifice of his owne Body and bloud after the order of Melchisedech.

But what reason is this, (sayth M. Jewel) Melchisedech brought forth Breade and Wyne to banquet Abraham, and his armie being weary of the chase. Ergo there is a Priuate Masse in the Church.

I alleged not, nor is there any ancient Dottour that alleged the figure of Melchisedech for priuate Masse, but for the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe, which is offered in the Masse. And I denie not but that Melchisedech brought forth Breade and wyne unto Abraham for refreshing of his armie, but whereas the Scriptures saith with sayth, for he was the Priest of the highest God. except wee make it a foolish cause, wee must beleue, that

that
that
that
that
that

S. Augu-
stine &c.
In psal. 110
concio-
ne. 2.

Jewel.

A Rejoindre to

he was wou^te to offer the same things to God, which then he brought forth to Abraham, though to him for meate, to God for Sacrifice.

Welch's sacri-
fice avou-
ced by f
fathers.

If any Jewel wil not beleene me, for witnesse herof may it please him to reade S. Cyprian ad Cæcilium . S. Ambrose lib. 5. de Sacramentis. cap. 1. S. Hierome vpon the .26. chapter of S. Matthew . Damascen de orthodoxa fide lib. 4. Cap. 14. S. Chrysostome in his Homilie De proditiōe Iudæ . S. Augustine in Psal. 33. concione prima . In all which places he shall fynde this mater of Melchisedeches Sacrifice plainly a-
uouched.

The prop-
hete of
Malachi
referred to
the Sacri-
fice of the
Church.
Mala. i:

Touching the Prophecie of Malachias, by the exposition in
manner of al the Fathers, it repositeth y^e Sacrifice of the Body and
Bloud of Christ dayly offered in y^e Masse. I haue no liking in you
(saith that Prophet in y^e person of God to the Jewes) and no gift
wil I take of your hand. From the rising of the Sunne to the going
downe, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in euery place
there is Sacrificed and offered to my name a pure Oblation. The
Sacrifices of the Jewes being reiected and ended, which
in comparison of the moste sweete and pleasaunt Sacrifice
of the Body and Bloude of our Saniour Christ, were both for
the shedding of Beastes bloude base, and also to God of them
selve displeaunt, as they which were but Figures of Christs
most precious Sacrifice: what other special Sacrifice or Obla-
tion can the Prophet iustly be thought to haue meant, that should
be offered to God throughout al the world in euery place, and
of him be repaid for pure and cleane, but the Blessed Sacri-
fice of the Church, wherein the Body and Bloud of Christ
is offered vnbloodily to his Father by Priestes of the New
Testament :

...for he was the Father of the high God, and
...that was a beautiful name, that was a name, that

But M. Jewel, as they of Luthers schoole do, taketh this place of Malachias for spiritual Sacrifice which is common to al the faithful, for the Sacrifice of their holy Communion, where (as he saith,) al the people dothe lifte vp their handes and hattes vnto beauen, pray and Sacrifice together, reioys and praise the Lorde. And when he hath said al that he could say in commendation of this Communion, he can make but a spiritual Sacrifice of it.

The sacrifice of the new Communion. Jewel.

which meaning squareth not with the saying of this prophet for sundry considerations. First, whereas he speaketh of a pure Sacrifice, no workes of man can seme to be such, for as much as al our workes and doinges euen the very best and inest of al, as Luther and his disciples do teach, be as Esay saith, *tanquam pannus menstruatus*, like a defiled cloth. wherefore they can not absolutely be called a pure Sacrifice or Oblation, specially of M. Jewel, if he will stande to his great Master Luthers doctrine, who holdeth opinion, that al our good workes and righteousnesse before God are fyennes.

Esay. 64.

Againe, to offer by our worke as a pure Oblation and Sacrifice, that calleth M. Jewel and his felowes who haue þ spirit of this new gospel, *pharisaical*. But this prophete speaketh not of a *pharisaical* Sacrifice.

Furthermore, forasmuch as spiritual Sacrifices, of which M. Jewel expoundeth this prophete of Malachias, be they prayers, praises, reioysinges in the Lorde, or what els so euer: they be not the proper and peculiar sacrifices of the lawe of the gospel, vnder which we liue now, but they were common in al lawes, as wel in the lawe of nature, and the lawe of Moyses, as in the new lawe. Now this prophete speaketh of a sacrifice that is proper, special, singular, and peculiar to the newe lawe. which is the pure sacrifice of the Altar, of the holy Eucharist, in which the body and blood of Christ purcheth vnder the formes of bread

A Reioindre to

bread and wine is by Priestes of the new testament without shedding of blood offered to God, throughout the whole world and in all nations; according to the commandment and institution of Christ, saying, do this in my remembrance. wherfore it is cleere that Malachies prophetic is to be vnderstanded of this Oblation and Sacrifice, which is offered to God in the Masse.

Thus vnderstode the auncient fathers that place of Malachias, for witnesseth whereof the auctoritie of S. Iustine the holy Martyr may suffice in steede of many others, whom it were easy to allege. In the Dialogue which he had at Ephesus with Tryphou the Jewe, he saith thus, speaking of Christians & Jewes Sacrifices. Al the Sacrifices which Iesus Christ hath ordeined to be done in his name, that is to say, in the Eucharist of the bread and of the cuppe, which are made of Christen men in euery place, God vsing preuention, witnesseth them to be acceptable vnto him. But those which are done by you and your Priestes, (he meaneth the Jewes) he disalloweth with these wordes, your sacrifices from your hands I wil not accept: because from the rising of the sunne to the going downe, my name is glorified among the Gentiles.

S. Irenaeus in his booke against the heresies of Valentius, speaking of this Sacrifice, which he calleth the new Sacrifice of the new Testament, which (by his report) Christ taught the Apostles, and the Apostles deliuered to the Church, & the Church offereth it to God in the whole world: confirmeth that doctrine by the expresse place of Malachias, saying, de quo in duodecim prophetis Malachias sic praesignificauit: Non est mihi voluntas in vobis. &c. Malachias one of the twelue prophetes, of this sacrifice hath thus foresignified: I haue no lyking in you saith our lord almighty, and of your handes I wil not take Sacrifice, because from the rising of the Sunne to the going downe my name is made glorious among the Nations, &c.

Con-

Iustinus
Martyr,
in Dialog.
contra
Iudeos.

Mala. 1.

Irenaeus.
lib. 4.
cap. 32.

Concerning the Institution of Christe, it is evident by the wordes of S. Luke the Euangelist, that Christe at his last Supper, ordeined this Sacrifice which we speake of. Hauing taken bread saith the Gospel, he gaue thanks, and brake, and gaue to them, saying: this is my body, which is geuen for you. Do ye this in my remembrance. Likewise (he toke) the cup after that he had supped, saying, (after that he had geuen thanks, as before) this is the cuppe the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. That here Christe offered and sacrificed, if we had nothing els to proue it, the wordes of the scripture, and the circumstance of the place, do witness it. For one to render thanks to God, taking a cuppe in his handes, and lifting it vp, after the rite and manner of the Iewes, is a very act of one that doeth Sacrifice. And so forasmuch as our Lorde said, Doo ye this, he commaunded the Apostles to do that which they sawe him do, that is to say, to offer vp the Sacrifice of thanks geuing, not only by geuing thanks in worde, but also by geuing and offering to God the body and blood of his Sonne, which by thalmighty power of the worde made present, are inuisibly in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine, are really contained. This was y^e faith of the Primitive Church, as we vnderstand by witness of S. Ignatius the Apostles scholer, whose wordes in an Epistle which he wrote ad Smyrneses, as Theodoritus allegeth, be these. Eucharistias & oblationes non admittunt, quod non constentur Eucharistiam esse carnem Seruatoris nostri Iesu Christi, quæ pro peccatis nostris passa est, quam pater sua benignitate suscitauit. These heretikes admit not the Eucharistes and Oblations, because they will not confesse that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Sauour Iesus Christe, which hath suffered for our sinnes, which the Father hath raised vp againe by his goodnesse. Here haue we expressly the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Sauour Iesus Christ.

The institution of Christ.
Luc. 22.

Theodorit.
dialog. 3.

A Reioindre to

And what flesh? Euen that which hath suffered for our synnes, and hath risen againe, whereby al tropes and figures of the Zwingliās, al enargies, vertues and efficacies of y Caluinistes, al ouerthwarte and blinde phrascs of M. Iewel, be defeated and quite put away.

Christes
Sacrifice
at his sup
per ac=
knowle=
ged by the
olde fa=
thers.

lib. 2. ep. 3.

1. Cor. 11.

Thus the Church vnderstode this mysteric in S. Cyprians time, who writing to Cæcilius, saith thus. The scripture saith, so oftentimes as ye eate this bread and drinke this cuppe, ye shal shewe forth the death of our Lorde vntil he come. Wherefore so oftentimes as we offer the cuppe in remembrance of our Lorde and of his Palsion, let vs do that, which it is euident that our Lord did: Againē likewise there within a litle. We are admonished and instructed of our Lorde (saith he) that we offer our Lordes cuppe with wine mingled, according to that as our Lord offered.

Ireneus

lib. 4. cap.

32.

To this agreeth S. Ireneus, who was so neare the Apostles time. The cuppe (saith he) likewise Christe confessed to be his blood, and taught the newe oblation of the newe testament.

Which the Church receiuing of the Apostles, offereth al the worlde ouer to God, which geueth vs foode. &c. And in an other

place of the same Booke, he saith, We offer vnto him the Eu-

charist, nor as to one that hath nede, but that we may geue thakes

for his giste.

lib. 4. cap.

34.

Here may M. Iewel be apposed in these questions out of S. Ireneus: when did Christe confesse the cuppe, that is to say that which was contained in the cuppe, to be his blood? was it not at his last supper? The scripture saith yes. when taught Christe the Apostles that newe Oblation of the newe Testament? It was not at his supper, when and where els? No man liuing is habile to tel vs any other time or place. Then was it taught at his supper. what is that newe Oblation, peculiar to the newe Testament, which the Church hath receined of the Apostles, and

That the
institution
of Christe
is rightly
alleged for
the sacri=
fice of the
Church.

Mat. 26.

Lnc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

now

now offereth to God ouer the whole world: Can M. Iewel, or any of his companions name vnto vs any other, then the Oblation of the body and bloud of Chryste in the daily Sacrifice of the Church? Name they what they wil beside this, and their error wil plainly appeare. what so euer spiritual Oblation they name (for outward Oblation they acknowledge none) be it prayer, praise, thanks-giving, reioysing in the Lorde, a contrite harte, or what so euer els: the same is neither new, nor peculiar to the newe testament. For al these were offered by them of the olde testament, and are common to al times and lawes.

By this it is euident how truly and rightly I alleaged the Institution of Chryste, for this new Oblation of the new testament, as S. Irenæus calleth it, that is the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Chryste, which is daily celebrated by the Church in the Masse. wherevnto a longer treatise were requisite I confesse, but this is ynough to stay the Faith of a Christen man for this present, who being vnlearned might be deceiued through occasion of M. Iewels light scoffes. So now the indifferent Reader seeth more weight to be in the figure of Melchisedech in the Prophecie of Malachias, and in Chrystes Institution, for proufe of the Sacrifice of the Masse, then M. Iewel would his reader to beleue, by his light reasons, which for that purpose no man maketh but him selfe, going about to make it appeare none at al.

After the scoffing argumentes, wherby M. Iewel thought to abase the auctoritie of the figure of Melchisedech, the prophecie of Malachias, and the Institution of Chryste: he commeth to denye the auncient Doctours, which I alleaged as witnesses of the vnbloody Sacrifice of the Church, and not for private Masse, as he falsly & contrarie to his owne knowledge pectendeth. Of al them that I alleage, he alloweth not one. Yet, as he

M. Iren.
denieth
auncient
Doctours
for lacke
of better
answer.

A Reioindre to

is crafty, he durst not denye them al openly. Some he denieth flatly, condemning them for sabelers, for heretikes, for secrete vrryers, for suspect men, for vnknoyen Doctours vntil this time. Some he would faine discredite by light furnises, gheasses, coniectures, and supposinges. Some he letteth passe with silence, trusting to shoul-der them out of credite by the contempt of the rest, whom he nameth.

which be
the doc-
tours that
M. Jew
denieth
for wit-
nessing the
Sacrifice

The Doctours whom he vtterly denieth be these. S. Clemēt, Abdias, Martialis, and S. Hippolytus, S. Iames, and S. Chryso- stome for their Liturgies. S. Dionyse, he would deface his auc- toritie if he wist how. Yet to that purpose is *Erasmus* brought in, a man for many pointes now growen to be of smal auctoritie, and one *John Colet*, who neuer wrote of S. Dionyse. And many others forsooth graue and learned men. which if he could haue na- med, they should haue put to their helping hande, to bolster vp this badde mater, sith that *Erasmus* writing contra Parisienles, and *John Colet* be alleged. Had it not bene for shame, he would haue named *Peter Martyr*, *John Caluine*, *Illyricus*, *Bale*, and such others of his syde, that be not yet canonizate for graue and learned men. If I had done so, he would haue said, I had brought in *Mummers*. But *M. Jewel* may pardon himself, and do as him listeth, so he please the people, and kepe his penne and tongue walking, least the plaiers of these new entercludes, should be hissed out of their stage for holding their peace.

Of the Auctoritie of S. Clements Constitutions.

M. Jew.
reasons for
the discre-
dite of S.
Clements
booke.
Phil. 4.

Now let vs see, what good reason and arguments he brin- geth for discredite of these auncient fathers. And first tou- ching S. Clement, of whom S. Paule maketh mention to the *Philippians*, as of his worke felow, With Clement and with the rest of my worke felowes. The booke of his that I allege for the Sacrifice of the Church, is intituled *Constitutiones Aposto- licae*, the Constitutions of the Apostles, But *S. Hierome* (saith *M. Jewel*)

Jewel (by the report of Eusebius maketh mention * only of one Epistle of Iewel. Clementes, that he thought worthy to be received. One other Epistle of The. 18. Clementes he speaketh of, but he saith, it was neuer allowed by the church. vntruth, he maketh mention of more. For prouise herof he referreth the readers by his note in y^e margin to S. Hierome de Eccles. scriptoribus. To this I answer.

Although S. Hierome made mention but of one Epistle written by S. Clement, yet therof it followeth not, that he wrote no more but that one Epistle. Other men might mention other his workes, as true it is. Now M. Jewel is so bold with S. Hierome in this place, as he is with me oftentimes. For S. Hierome maketh mention of an other booke of S. Clements, which he doth expressly acknowledge to be S. Clementes, and that he was earnestly moued by Gaudentius a bishop, to translate the same into Latine. This shal M. Jewel finde reported by S. Hierome himselfe, in the end of Origenes commentaries vpon the Epistle to y^e Romanes, which he translated into Latine, where he calleth S. Clement, Apostolorum Comitum, the Apostles follower or fellow, wherof M. Jewel seemeth to reprove me. That S. Hierome then maketh mention only but of one Epistle of S. Clement, if by his terme onely he exclude al other workes, it is one of the number of M. Jewels manifest and proued vntruthes.

And further (saith M. Jewel) S. Hierome saith, certaine other bookes there are reported to be abrode in the name of Clement, as. &c. wherof saith S. Hierome so goodly: you must be staide in your tale at y^e first I see wel, for if you be let comen, you wil tel no lies the one in a sentence. S. Hierome speaketh but of one booke, why speake you of certaine bookes? Can not your doctrine stand but in lyes multiplied in the plural number? S. Hierome in dede saith, that the long talke between S. Peter and Appion was reported to be S. Clements, & that Eusebius reproveth it. And al y^e I graunt. But what is that to the reproofe of the booke which I alleged?

A Reioindre to

Your gentle manner is to deuise weake arguments of your owne mery head, and report them as made by me. This may be sene throughe your whole Replie. I pray you geue me leaue to requitte you with an argument not deuised by me, but made by your owne selfe. It is euen this. The talke between S. Peter and Appion (Eusebius nameth it dialogues) was vntuly reported to be S. Clementes: Ergo, S. Clement wrote not the booke intituled, Constitutionum Apostolicarum. The argument is very folish, yet is it M. Jewels.

τουτο δ' εστι
αλογον.
Eccle. hist.
lib. 3.

Jewel.

M. Jew.
disposse
of S. Cle-
ments booke

The. 19.
vntuly,
for it was
both hard
of, & sene
before.
Jewel.

The 20.
vntuly.
they were
known to
fathers
of most a-
ges, as
here it is
mouched.
where S.
Clements
booke of
late yeres
hath ben
founde.

Now vyhence then commeth M. Hardinges Clement? saith M. Jewel. Thereto he answereth him selfe with such truth as becommeth such teachers. It was founde very lately in the Ile of Candie, by one Carolus Capellius a Venetian, vwritten in Greke, and in these countries * neuer heard of, nor sene before. His author is Peter Crabbe the Gray friere of Machlin. Were he triumpheth, as though he had wonne great honour at my hand, And would nedes the Reader to be iudge in the mater, vyhetber it be liklye, that the bookes of S. Clement being Bishop of Rome, so strange, so holy, of such vweight, (thus it pleaseth him to scoffe) were kept in an Iland in the Sea, so farre from Italie, and not at Rome. That they were vwritten in Greke, not in Latine, that they could be laid vp in secrecie * for the space of a thousand five hundred yeres and more, and no man misse them. All these thinges he would to be considered by the Reader, be he neuer so simple.

Now be the Reader neuer so simple, yet if he be not also wilfully disposed to beleue M. Jewel, when he is proued a lyer: he may easily vnderstand the truth. which touching this booke is this. That Carolus Capellius a Venetian founde a booke in Candie intituled the Constitutions of the Apostles, I deny not. That it was neuer in these countries heard of, nor sene before, that

that I denye. For as that Venetian founde one booke, so before him other bookes of the same were in the libraries of other men. One hath ben founde of late in that parte of Italie, which is called Calabria, by the learned man Franciscus Turrianus. Another was founde in Sicilia by a learned man named Antonius Augustinus bishop of Mlerda in Spaine. And the same bishop bought an other for his money in Candie, which was a learned mannes booke there named Andreas Donus. which booke he gaue to F. Turrianus, as he taketh recozd of Zacharias Marapharas a learned Candiotte of late Agent in Venice for Ioasaph the Patriarke of Constantinople, whose Greke verses he set before the booke printed in Greke at Venice by Iordanus Ziletus at the procurement of Franciscus Turrianus, who betwix and conferred these bookes together, as he declarerth, and so with most diligence hath set it forth to the great commoditie of the church. As these thre haue ben kepte in thre sundry countries, so there is no doubt, but many moe be kept in other places.

F. Turrianus in Prolegomenis.

Now to M. Jewels substantiall argumente.

S. Clement was bishop of Rome, ergo it is not likely that his bookes Jewell.

were kepte in Candie, and not in Rome. As though bookes made in Rome, or written by the bishops of Rome, were not subject to fyre and violence of souldiers, at the sundry burninges and sackinges of that Citie, as other bookes and thinges were.

That this booke was laid by in secretie for the space of fiftien hundred yeres and mo, so as no man missed it al that while, And that it was neuer heard of nor sene before Carolus Capellins time: al these be false lyes. For the contrary is wel and sufficiently proued, as here the Reader may see, which is already declared by testimonie of S. Hierome before mentioned. The same wil I now proue by testimonies of other writers, which partly be already set forth in latine by Carolus Bouius a Bishop,

A Reioindre to

but much more copiously by Franciscus Turrianus in his greke
Prolegomena befoze S. Clement.

Testimonies for S. Clements booke of Constitutions.

*Ad finem
capitis. 34.
Canonum
Apostoli-
corum.
The
cause why
S. Cle-
ments booke
hath ben
kept se-
cret.*

First in the Canons of the Apostles alwaies much esteemed of
the Grekes, expresse mention is made of this very booke
with these wordes. Constitutiones, (for so doth the Greke worde
ἰσταται signifie) quæ vobis episcopis per me Clementem in li-
bris octo nūcupatæ sunt. The constitutions (of the Apostles) haue
ben set forth to you the bishops by me Clement in eight bookes,
There these wordes folow immediatly. Quas omnibus publicare
non oportet, ob quædam arcana quæ in se continent. These Con-
stitutions (saith he) must not be made common to al, because of
certaine secret things which be contained in them. And this may
be the cause, why this booke hath not ben so common as other
bookes, that the mysteries of our religion should not be publi-
shed to the infidels to be mockt, as our newe Gospellers mocke
them at this day. If M. Jewel be loth to allowe the auctoritie of
those Canons, as he is a great condemner of bookes, and loth to
admitte any for good and authentical that make ought against
him: for thapprobation of them, I remit him to Gregorius Halo-
ander of Germanie the interpreter of the same: who sheweth
good euidence for their auctoritie in the ende of his Translation.
I trust his iudgement shalbe liked the better in this case, because
he is no Papist, though in the race of the newe Gospel, he ranne
not so farre, as M. Jewel and his companions.

Ignatius.

The auctoritie of these eight bookes containing the Consti-
tutions or ordinances of the Apostles, is acknowledged and ve-
ry much vled for the better disposition of churches, by the holy
 Martyr S. Ignatius, that was so nye to the Apostles time, as it
appeareth by sundry places of his Epistles, which he wrote to
sundry Churches, as he passed forth in his journey to Rome, there
to.

to be put to Martyrdom. In which places he letteth not to put diuerse sentences of S. Clement, worde for worde, as he had found them in this booke. And though he name him not expressly, as the manner of wyters is in allegations, yet he sheweth good and clere euidence, that he meant this very booke of the Apostles Constitutions. To recite here the sentences, which he tooke out of S. Clement for his purpose, it were long and tedious, who is thereof desirous, in the p̄face of Carolus Bouius set befoze his Latine translation of the booke, he may see them, and conserre them together.

If M. Jewel denye that S. Ignatius wrote these epistles, as it is his com̄d shift to denye the Doctor with whose words he is manifestly conuicted: may it please him to vnderstand, they wil be auouched and appoyed by the testimonies of S. Irenæus, S. Athanasius, Eusebius, and specially of S. Hierome.

S. Athanasius that great pillour of the Church in his time, writing to one Ammus, hauing occasion to speake of holy bookes, diuideth them into two orders. In the one he placeth the bookes of the Canonical scriptures, in the other, such as be read and wel esteemed, but not equal in auctoritie with the canonical bookes.

Making special mention of these thus he saith. I adde this further also, that there be certaine bookes beside these (he meaneth the bookes of the holy Scriptures) which be not approued for Canonical, yet haue ben made of holy fathers like vnto these, and be reade of them that of late came to the faith, and be taught the doctrine of our religion. They be these. The wisdom of Salomon, Syrach, Hester, Iudith, Tobias, et doctrina quæ vocatur Apostolorum, and the boke which is called the doctrine of the Apostles. wherby he signifieth the Constitutions of the Apostles written by S. Clement, as Zonaras the Greeke expositor of the Canons writeth many to haue said.

*Athanas.
in Epist.
ad Ammū
monachū.*

A Reioindre to

Among other the most auncient Fathers S. Dionysius Arcopagita maketh mention of this Clement, calling him a philosopher, libro de Diuinis nominibus. cap. 5. where Pachymeres vnderstandeth him to meane S. Clement of Rome, and that after the minde of the olde interpreters.

*Cyrillus
Hierosoly-
mitanus
Catechesi-
st.*

Cyrillus bishop of Jerusalem a Doctor of great antiquitie, in his booke intituled Catecheses, maketh mention of this booke of S. Clement, and vseth his auctoritie concerning the reuiving of the byrde Phoenix for proufe of the resurrection. He letteth not to vse the wordes of S. Clement, as they be written in his fifth booke with very litle alteration. This is to be sene in Cyrillus, Catechesi. 18.

If M. Jewel with his denying iudgement allowe not this Doctor notwithstanding his antiquitie, because he maketh very much for the veritie of Christs body in the blessed Sacrament: we may proue him by sufficient witnesses. Besides al these which make mention of him, Theodorus, lib. 5. cap. 3. Socrates, lib. 3. cap. 29. Sozomenus, lib. 4. cap. 25. Epiph. lib. 3. tom. 1. heres. 73. Nicephorus, lib. 9. cap. 14. & 46. Beside these I say, Theodorus in polymorpho dialogo. 2. doth expressly alleage the Catecheses of this auncient Doctor. And so doth Damascenus, lib. 3. Apologetico pro Imaginibus.

*lib. 1. heres.
45.*

Epiphanius maketh mention of these Constitutions in diuerse places. In his first booke speaking against the heretikes named Seueriani, he saith thus. If the name of the vine be to be reprov'd, our Lorde would neuer haue applied vnto him selfe the similitude of that name. Sed etiam Apostoli dicunt in ea quæ dicitur Constitutio, catholica ecclesia est plantatio Dei et vitis. And the Apostles also in that booke which is named their Ordinance, say the Catholike Church is the planting of God and a vine. This is found in the beginning of the Constitutions set forth

*In pro-
mis.*

forth by S. Clement.

S. Chrysostome, or who so euer els was the authoꝝ of that imperfect worke vpon S. Marthew, (that very auncient he was certaine it is) in the. 53. Homilie speaketh of this booke especially, and allegeth the eight booke of the Apostles Canons.

Of this very booke mentioneth Damascenus; lib. 4. de orthodoxa fide, where he reherseth the bookes of the holy Scriptures, and nameth S. Clement, as authoꝝ of these very Canons of the Apostles in this booke conteyned. Proclus also the Patriarke of Constantinople, speaking of the tradition of the diuine Sacrifice, acknowledgeth these bookes. Likewise doth Oecumenius in his commentaries vpon the first Epistle to Timothy, and Pachymeres, as is before noted, & Nicolaus also bishop of Methone in Grece, & Marcus Ephesinus, as Carolus Bouius partly allegeth, and the places be commonly known.

Notwithstanding these proues and witnesses of good authority, who liued from the Apostles time to our dayes, in sundry ages, and in sundry partes of the world, M. Jewel most shamefully writeth in his Replie, that this booke of S. Clement was neuer heard of, nor sene before. If he may be magnified and accompted for a worthy Jewel of England, hauing made so many, so great, so notorious, so impudent lyes as this is, and as he hath stuffed his Replie withal: what wil he be either afraid, or ashamed to affirme stoutely both in writing and preaching, be it neuer so false? But though he deceiue the vlearned people, though he be animated and clapped on the shoulders of them of his syde, though al be wel lyked that he doth, of them which would faine al were taken for truth, that is spoken against the Catholikes: yet hath he no regard of that hyde of his owne conscience, which daily singeth him a contrary song: of wise and learned men, who though they be not permitted to speake the

A Reioindre to

truth, yet full clerely see the truth, and wonder at the outrageous impudencie of his lying; of the posteritie, that shal duly examine the pointes, wherin he goeth from truth and reason, and without feare setteth forth to þ world both his and his felowes manifold deceites? Merely he seemeth to be so farre swallowed vp in þ gulfe of vaine glozy, that to winne the praises of the light multitude, who measureth these thinges by their wilful phantasies, and to be taken for a worthy captaine of that bande, he sicketh nor utterly to lose the estimation of the grauest, wisest, and best learned, beside the dangerous state of his soule, which is brought into more then most terrible hazard, by deceiuing gods people redeemed with so dere a price.

*Epiphani-
us contra
Audianos.
hæres. 70.*

But who is euer they were, that found fault with this booke of S. Clement, yet may the graue iudgement of that annient and holy Father Epiphanius be set against their opinion. For he denieth that any thing contrary to the faith is in S. Clements bookes contained. For disputing against the heretikes named Audiani, who fled to the auctoritie of these bookes, thus he saith of them. The Audians do bring forth the Constitution of the Apostles, (so he termeth S. Clements booke whereof we speake) which by many is doubted of. But for al that it is not to be disallowed. For it hath nothing that is amisse touching faith and confession, neither touching the Ecclesiastical gouernement and rule. For by Epiphanius iudgement, there is nothing to be mispyked in these Constitutions of the Apostles written by S. Clement, neither for doctrine, nor for Discipline. In which two thinges the Summe of true religion consisteth.

Thus is our booke of the Apostles Constitutions, that S. Clement wrote, by sufficient witnesses approued. who is desirous to see further proues for it, may it please him to read Car. Bouius in præfatione, and E. Turrianus in prolegomenis, there

there shal he finde whereby to be sacrificed at large. To M. Jewe
cl what may be said, who hauing a most manifest place for the
vnbloody Sacrifice of the Church laid before him out of this
booke, not being habile by anye shifte or colour to auoyd it;
thought it to be þe surest way to deny the boke: But how impu-
dently he hath denyed it, this much being knowen, who seeth not?

First wherreas he auoucheth, that S. Hierome by report of Euse-
bius maketh mention onely of one Epistle of S. Clementes, there is one
vnt ruth, as now we haue proued out of S. Hierome him selfe,
in peroratione ad finem comment. Origenis in Epist. ad Roma-
nos. That S. Hierome saith, certaine other bookes there are re-
ported to be abroad in the name of Clement, as the disputation of Peter and
Appion, vvhich bookes vvere neuer in vse among our fathers, neither containe
they pure and Apostolical doctrine: for asmuch as it is alleged to the
discredit of the boke of þe Constitutions, which is specially spokē
of, and S. Hieromes wordes be not so written,* there is the vnt-
ruth of a falsifier. That this boke was neuer heard of nor sene
before, there is the third vnt ruth. That it was laid vp in secre-
cie for the space of a M. v. C. yeres and moze, and no man missed
it: there is the iij. vnt ruth. That it is disallowed by * Euseb. & by
S. Hierom, there is the v. vnt ruth, for they disallow only the dis-
putation between S. Peter & Appion. That it was condemned by
* Gelasius, there is the sixt vnt ruth. And beside þe dishonesty of a
manifest lye, the argument which he maketh, is foolish and very
childish, which is this. Gelasius condemned itinerarium Petri,
a boke falsly fathered vpon S. Clement containing eight bookes:
Ergo he condemned this booke of the Apostles Constitutions
containing also eight bookes. As good an argument as this:
The church hath reiected a certaine Epistle reported to be writ-
ten by S. Paule to the Laodicians: ergo it hath reiected S.
Pauls Epistle to the Romaines.

Seuen
lies made
by M.
Jew. for
disprouing
of S. Cle-
ment's
bookes.

The. 11.
vnt ruth
in falsifi-
ing S.
Hierome.
The. 12.
vnt ruth,
they do
not disal-
low this
booke.
The. 13.
vnt ruth.
It is not
condemned
by Gela-
sius.
Dist. 15.
Saul's
Romans
1. part.

A Reioindre to

Lastly, that this booke was kept forth comming in close ppyson
foz the space of. xv. C. yeres, there is the seventh vnturth.

As foz Bessarion, his age is to young, and his auctoritie to
light (though otherwise and foz his time a worthy mā) to be set
in balance against so many fathers, so auncient, so learned, cuer
had in so much credite. Besyde this it pertained to the furtherāce
of the point that there he treated of, to make the least he could of
this bookes auctoritie.

But how hangerth this together, this booke was kept in
close prison foz the space of. xv. C. yeres, yea in these countries he
was neuer heard of, nor sene before, as *W. Jewel* saith: and yet
Bessarion who wrote that litle booke de Sacramento Eucharis-
tie aboute a C. yeres past, had not only sene it him selfe, but sig-
nifieth also, that it was commonly knowen before his time? Foz
so much his wordes doo impozte speaking of a custome, which
hath relation to the former times.

*Comme-
morari so-
leant.*

*W. Jewel
sowly con-
trarieth
hun selfe.*

Againe if *M. Hardinges Clement* (as *W. Jewel* speaketh) be dis-
allowed by *Eusebius*, and by *S. Hierome*, mistrusted by Bessarion, condemned
by *Gelasius*: how was he then in these countries neuer heard of
nor sene before the late daies of *Carolus Capellius* the Venetian?
Could *W. Hardinges Clement* be disallowed, mistrusted, and
condemned before he was cuer sene or heard of? If the booke
were disallowed and condemned, then was the booke. Foz a thing
is not condemned, that is not. If it be not, then neither is it con-
demned. If then the booke was, in the times of those y^e spake so a-
gainst it, how is it true that *W. Jewel* saith, that it was neuer
heard of nor sene? He should better haue remembred the old pro-
uerbe, that requireth a lie to be mindefull.

*S. Cle-
ment being
sufficient-
ly proued
to be no*

All this being true, *S. Clements* booke standeth vnshakē in his
auctoritie as before, notwithstanding *W. Jewels*, vij. ypes, penish
arguments, & vaine sleights, wherewith he goeth about to deface
it,

it, specially because of þ place for þ Sacrifice out of him alleged. which place not being answered, I require him to yelde to the truth by S. Clement reported. The words be these. Pro Sacrificio cruento rationale & incruentum ac mysticum Sacrificium instituit, quod in mortem Domini per symbola Corporis & Sanguinis ipsius celebratur. For the bloody Sacrifice (of the old lawe) Christ hath instituted the reasonable, and vnbloudy and mystical Sacrifice, which is celebrated in remembrance of our Loyds death by signes of his Body and Blood. This Sacrifice can be no other, then the daily Sacrifice of the Church, the oblation of the Body and Bloude of Christ offered by the Priest in the Masse vnder the formes of bread and wine. And thus is al that M. Jewel hath brought against S. Clement either in his glorious Sermon at Pauls Crosse, or in his Replie, clerely refuted and wiped away, and the Sacrifice remaineth proued.

counterfete
wyter. 20
Jewel is
bound by
his pro-
mise to
yeeld and
subscribe.
Clemens
Constitu-
tionum
Apostoli-
carum
lib. 6. cap.
23.

How vntuly and vwith vybat smal reason Abdias
is refuted of M. Jewels

What truth M. Jewel hath vsed to deface the authority of S. Clement, the lyke hath he vsed to disproue the booke of Abdias, in which the storie of the Apostles is conteyned. First he reynoueth me to haue said more of Abdias, then I said in deede, as my booke doth witness, which is a great vnt ruth. For neither say I that he was conuersant with Christ, nor that he heard Christ preach, but that he saw our Saviour in flesh, which I found so affirmed both in the preface of Julius Africanus set before the booke, and also in the booke it selfe. But he helpeth the learned man wolfgangus Lazius much worse, whom he misnameth Razius, who found this booke in two sudy alicet monasteries. For he maketh him to say

The. 24.
vnt ruth.
I saye not
so.
Lib. 6.
The. 25.
vnt ruth.
Lazius
doth not so
farre
wyte.

A Reioindre to

Jewel. farre otherwise then he saith, * that S. Luke the Euangelist, writing the Actes of the Apostles, borrowed many whole stories worde by worde out of Abdias. And therefore he concluding, as though it were so in deede, sayth, that then S. Luke was ynthankesful, that neuer once made mention of his Author.

M. I. Ieso.
beliedh La-
zius with
an impi-
dent falsi-
fing.

Now Lazius saith not thus, but speaking of a doubt, that might rise to the Reader, for that many things which be written in the Actes, be rehearsed in the two first booke of Abdias: saith that it is to be thought, that either Abdias took those things out of S. Luke, or S. Luke out of Abdias seeing both liued in one time, and were the Apostles Scholers. This is al that Lazius saith touching this point. And why might he not say so? But **M. I.** Iewel after his common wont of falsifying, with a shamelesse eye destroying the disunctiue, and making a platne mater of it, affirmeth Lazius to saue, that S. Luke borrowed many whole stories worde by worde out of Abdias. Thus he helpeth both Lazius and me in the beginning of the disproufe of Abdias.

Abdias
was sofid
by three
sundry me
in three
sundry
places.

Sebastia
Munster

Touching the boke it selfe. Be it of that auctoritie it deserueth to be, and not otherwise. As I am not earnest to defend it, so neither see I any thing brought by **M. I.** Jewel for al his great triumph that he maketh thereof, why I should verely beleue that the boke is to be condemned. Neither was it founde out onely by wolfgangus Lazius in two diuers places, but also by Sebastian Munster being in his company at the one place, who with **M. I.** Jewel ought to be a man of good credite, because he hath aduentured th' enerlasting state of his soule by forsaking the Catholike Church, and by going aside with him into Zuinglius sect concerning the heresie of the Sacramentaries. And as Lazius had found two booke of Abdias, the one in Carinthia the other in Germanie: so long before that, Georgius wicelius the learned man founde an other copie of the same boke in an o-

Georgius
wicelius.

ther

ther place, as he writeth in his Epistle dedicatorie to Albertus Archebifhop of Maguntia, which he set before his worke intituled Vitæ Patrum, printed in the same Citie of Maguntia. Anno. 1546. which copie agreeth with the booke that Lazius founde, as by that which there he writeth, it appeareth. And like it is, the same booke may be founde in sundry other places, if it were with like diligence sought for. In consideration whereof M. Jewel hath to do about the denyal of Abdias, not with me onely, but also with Lazius, with his owne frende Gunter, and with Wicelius.

But let vs see what great reasons he allegeth, to disprove Abdias. First, he maketh many shamelesse lyes, sayth he, that he was present with Christ, and *at the most parte of the Apostles doings, which could not be, they being dispersed abroad so farre asunder into diuers coastes of the world. Again, where he speaketh of Iphigenia, he saith that the people toke her brother Beor christened by S. Mathew, and made him king, and that he reigned the space of lxxij. yeres. Furthermore he maketh mention of Egesippus, that liued a hundred and threescore yeres after Christe. And it is not likely, that he liued so long. Therefore he can not be Abdias.

Al this is sone answered. That he sawe Christe in flesh, M. Jewel saith it is a shamelesse lye, but rather he sheweth himselfe shamelesse so to saye, and not to proue it. Iulius Africanus writeth so of him in his Preface, and as yet M. Jewel bringeth no reason why I should beleue the contrarie. Is that a lye, because M. Jewel saith so? As he getteth to him selfe auctoritie to make lyes, so hath he also auctoritie to condemne whom it pleaseth him of lying: before we beleue this to be a lye, he must bring better proufe then his owne bare worde.

That he was at the moste parte of the Apostles doings, I thinke it not true, neither is it necessary to beleue, that Abdias saith so much of him selfe: neither sayth he so at al. It is

Jewel.

The reasons which M. Jew. bringeth against Abdias.

The 16, vntertruth, he sayth not so.

Answers to the reasons.

A Reioindre to

a Chamelelle Ipe of M. Jewel so to laye. It may appeare by the booke, that he was present at the death of S. Andrew and of S. John, who died not farre asunder. For Ephesus is not farre from Patrae, as it is euident to those that haue meane skill in Geographie. And their death was so long one after y other, that he had time ynough to be at both. At their deathes he might haue ben present, and at the doings of S. Simon and Jude, and thereof can folow no absurditie, what so euer M. Jewel laye. In dede the booke containeth a storie of the Apostles actes and doings, but that Abdias was him selfe present at al, it is not so recozded. Yet if he reported moze then he sawe, for truth of this mater, this much is to be knowen.

The office of Notaries in the primitive Church was to recozde the actes of Martyrs.

In the time of the Primitive Church, when in sundry partes of the world great numbres of Christian people wer put to most cruel death by the persecution of Infidels, by common consent in enery countrie some of moze learning then the rest, as Bishops and Deacons, were appointed to be publike Notaries, to put in wyting and register the worthy sightes of Martyrs, their miracles at their death wrought, and their whole Martyrdomes. These recozdes were sent from Church to Church, and diuulged abroad among the seruantes of God, y thereby al might receiue comfort, be stirred to the like constancie by their examples, that those notable actes should be kept in memorie, and that the name of God should be magnified. That this was so obserued, it may be gathered of y Eusebius writeth in the beginning of his fifth boke of the Ecclesiastical hystorie. So was the glorious death & Martyrdom of S. Andrew written by y Bishops & deacons of Achaia, as Philactetus is reported to witnesse. So were y things done in the cruel persecution of the Christians at Lions, and Vienna, registred by the learned Notaries, & from the Churches of those cities, sent to the Churches of Asia, and Hyrgia, as by Eusebius it is declared. The office of Notaries was instituted at

lib. 5. hist.
Eccles.

at the beginning by diuers Idopes, as Damasus writeth in Clemente, in Fabiano, in Anthero. &c.

Such recordes made of the Apostles doings, miracles & dea-thes, by great probability we are lead to beleue to haue come vnto the hands of Abdias, & that he made one volume of þe whole. In which volume where things are oftentimes reported in the first persō plural, they are not al of necessitie to be referred to Abdias, who was the gatherer of the booke, and so to be vnderstanded, as though he had thereby abouched his owne presence at the things so declared: but they may be taken for some part as written in the person of them that saw them, and were present at þe doing, and first registred them. which order of registering Abdias as thought good not to alter, but suffered such publicke recordes to remaine in the booke which he had compiled in that order reported, in which he founde them by the Notaries first written. As for example, whereas we finde these wordes written in the fifth booke which is of S. Iohn the Euangelist, where the raising of Dulsiana from death is declared, Vidimus, we sawe, and audiuius, we hearde: it is not necessarie hereof to thinke that Abdias was present at that miracle: (and whether he were or no I say not) but these may seme to be the wordes of the Notaries who wrote them, and were them selues presente, which Abdias in collection of the booke would not chaunge, but left them as spoken in their person. And so is Abdias cleared of the shamelesse lye, which he is charged with for that point, as one that of necessitie is not to be called to an account, how he could haue seene things done by the Apostles (as M. Iewel saith) in Scythia, in Iudia, in Asia minor, in Ethiopia, that be so many thousand myles asunder.

That he noteth of Iphigenia, and Beor her brother, who reigned in Ethiopia lxviij. yeares: I marvel what thing therein

It is

he

A Reioindre to

he should accompt for a shamelesse lye. May not a man by course of nature lyue so long as by report Abdias Beor lyued? Hane we not in our time sene men of the age of lxxxviij. yeares? For of that age was Beor at his death, by accompt of Abdias. And it is likely that men lyued as many yeares then, as now, when nature is thought somewhat to be decayd from the comon strength of that age. If S. Simeon the sonne of Cleopas, and Bishopp of Ierusalem next after S. James, lyued six score yeares, and notwithstanding y age shewed him selfe to be of so great strength at his martyrdome, that all wondred at it, as Egesippus writeth alleged by Eusebius: why might not King Beor lyue lxxxviij. yerres, and raigne lxxij. yerres?

Hist. Ec-
cle. lib. 3.
cap. 32. in
græc.

Jewel.

But Abdias (saith M. Jewel) maketh mention of Egesippus which liued eight score yerres after Christ. And there he maketh a ioly trisoph. If he sawv Christ, it is not likely that euer he sawv Egesippus. If he sawv Egesippus, it is not likely that euer he sawv Christe. This absurditie is sone auoyded. In al the booke it is not said, that he sawe Egesippus. Neither maketh he mention of Egesippus. That Egesippus is once in the sixth booke named, that is not to be attributed vnto Abdias, but to Iulius Africanus. who finding the storie of the Apostles, which Abdias had partly written in Hebrue him selfe, and partly had gathered into one boke out of the Registres made by the publike Notaries of diuers Churches, translated into Greke by Eutropius his scholar: tourned the same into the Latine tongue, as he saith him selfe, and disposed the whole into ten boke. wherin it is very euident, that he bound not him selfe to the scrupulous straightnesse of a translatour, but vled his owne libertie by putting in, and leauing out at his discretion, what he thought good, so as as he might best furnish the Church with a perfit storie of the Apostles

Iul. Afri-
canus in
præfati-
one.

Africanus
a writer
of Actes &
monumts

Apostles. For which cause it may as iustly be accompted the worke of Africanus, as of Abdias. tes of the
punitius
Church.

And the wyting of such Actes and monumentes of the Primitive Church, was belonging to Africanus by profession. For so witnesseth of him Martinus an auncient Chroniclewyter. who describing the times of the Emperour Gordianus the first, saith thus. Floruit his temporibus Iulius Africanus, nominatissimus in Ecclesia scriptor, qui vna cum alijs notarijs gesta martyrum scripsit, & multa in linguam Latinam traduxit. In these daies lyued Iulius Africanus a very famous wyter in the Church, which together with other Notaries wrote the Actes of Martyrs, and translated many thinges into the Latine tongue.

Now if we say that Africanus spake of Egesippus, and not of Abdias, then hath this fierce accuser of Abdias nothing, wherewith to charge him as a lyer in that behalf. If M. Jewel, or who so ever betwixt the booke of Abdias for him, had reade a fewe leaues farther, in the same sixth booke he shoulde haue founde the name also of Africanus him selfe, who though he be very auncient, yet lyued longe after Egesippus. And so he might haue made a more probable argumēt against Abdias in consideration of his age, and much better haue compared him with Ioannes de temporibus.

The mention of both may resonably be thought to haue ben put in by Africanus. Neither is it very straunge a writer of Stories sometimes to mention him selfe by name. Neither nameth he Egesippus onely alleging that he wrote touching Sainte James, but also Sainte Clement, and Craton, whose tenne bookes conteyning the Actes of Saint Simon and Saint Jude, he turned into the Latine speache

A Reioindre to

That it
was not
impossible
for Abdi-
as to haue
sene Ege-
sippus.

Egesip.
in quinto
Cōmen-
tariorū.

speech, as there he saith.

And whereas M. Jewel would seme to conclude a great absurditie against Abdias, for saing that he sawe Egesippus, affirming that he sawe Christe, it is not likely that euer he sawe Egesippus, and if he sawe Egesippus, it is not likely that euer he sawe Christe: If one would tel him, that Abdias might haue sene both Christ and Egesippus to, so farre as the likelyhod thereof could be proued, then were he controlled, as one that maketh triumph before he achue the victorie. That Abdias notwithstanding he had sene Christe in flesh, might also haue sene Egesippus, thus it is proued. If S. James might haue sene Egesippus, the why might not Abdias also haue sene him, specially whereas by report of Iulius Africanus calling him ¶ Apostles scholer, he semeth to haue ben younger man then the Apostles. That S. James might haue sene him, it is proued by Egesippus owne wordes, who speaking of S. James, saith that he continued from the time it selfe that our Lorde lyued in, vntil his time, for so be his very wordes, ab ipsis Domini temporibus perdurans vsque ad nos. But herein I stand not with M. Jewel, for I iudge that in dede Abdias neuer sawe Egesippus, specially as a writer of the thinges in the booke of Abdias alleged. Yet his rashnes is to be noted, that writeth so peremptorily of a thing, the contrary whereof may so probably be auouched.

Jewel.
A heape
of lies,

Touching the mater of the booke, if it be nothing els for the more parte of it, as M. Jewel saith, but a vaine penish tale, laid out vwith falsshed, vicked doctrine, and curious conference, and talke vwith Devils: why was M. Jewel so peruissh as to condemne it hauing so great store of mater against it, without shewing reasch, learning or authoritie of some due allegation? If he accuse it of falsshed and wicked doctrine, why did he not shewe to the world (specially seing that he made so much a doo about it at Pauls

Whales Crosse in that vaine forerunning Sermon of his) what
be pointes of falshe, and wicked doctrine that he noted: Is it
enough for M. Jewel, only to say so? Thinketh he that men
will beleue him because he speaketh the word? Nay ought he
not rather to thinke, that whatsoeuer he saith besides and con-
trary to other men, that it will the lesse be beleued, because he
saith it: Verely if the vnlerned knew his custom of lying, as
wel as lerned men see it manifestly: they would hardly beleue
him, when he telleth truth.

For better commoditie of my utterance, and to the intent
all may the better be vnderstanded, euen there in the middes
of the matter of Abdias, I craue leave of the Reader to beare
with me, if I alter some what the order of my talke, and from
hence forth for the auoyding of the tedious rehearsal of I say, and
M. Jewel saith, put both our two names befoze both our say-
enges. And euen here to beginne (oure former matter of
Abdias being continued) let it be considered, what reason and
authorities he bringeth for discredit of Abdias.

Iewel.

It may be gathered by S. Augustine in sundry places, that some
parte of this booke was written by certain Heretikes named the Ma-
nichees, and auouched by them as the very true storie of the Apo-
stles.

Harding.

It is not true that you saye M. Jewel. S. Augustine
writeth not so much as one worde of this booke of Abdias,
nor maketh he any mention at al of Abdias throughout his

I. whole

The 27.
vntuth.
S. Augu.
hath no
such thing
of Abdias
Aug. con
tra Fau-
stum. lib.
11. & lib.
22. cap.
80.

A Reioindre to

whole worke. And whereas you haue noted the margine of your booke, with this quotation, *August. contra Faustum. lib. 11.* trade ouer that booke who will; and he shal finde no worde spoken whereby it may be gathered this booke of Abdias after the opinion of S. Augustine, to haue been written by the Manichees. By this your vntreue dealing shal appeare to your bitter discredit. Now let the proufe of your saying be heard and discussed.

Iewel.

The. 18.
vntreue.
The. 19.
vntreue.
He reporteth it not
The. 30.
vntreue.
Not in
such order

For he reporteth the Fables of S. Thomas, * of S. Mathew, of * S. Andrew, of the Lion that slue the man that had striken S. Thomas, of the dogge that brought the same mannes hande vnto the table: of Maximilla wiue vnto Egiu, and other like tales, * euen in such order as they be set forth by this Abdias.

Harding.

Marke wel good Reader how reasonably M^r. Jewel proueth that he affirmed. Because he setteth forth in his Replie many folish arguments, fattering the same vnto me, which I make not, as by cōference of the place it may appeare: I thinke good here truly to put before thine eyes his argument, making it no worse then it is. The same is this.

S. Augustine reporteth the fables of S. Thomas, of S. Mathew, of S. Andrew, of Maximilla. &c. Ergo it may be gathered of S. Augustine, that some parte of this booke was written by the Manichees.

Both to the Learned there appeareth small Logike, and to a natural man small reason in this argument. And yet is it M^r. Jewel that made it, who scoffeth so much at other mennes arguments. As great a Clerke as he is taken to be of his own decreaned brethren, yet in this point, as he sheweth him selfe to wake in reason, so also slender in knowledge. For he findeth not in S. Augustine in the places by him alleged, that the Manichees, (who condemned

M^r. Jew.
sheweth
his igno-
rance.

condemned the bookes of the Olde Testament, and receaued some partes of the new Testament, such as they liked, affirming the rest to be corrupted and falsified) leaned to the authoritie of bookes by them selues written, requiring them to be esteemed as equal with the Scriptures, or that they hadde written the bookes, which as S. Augustine saith, they preferred befoze the Scriptures, but that they had Scripturas Apocryphas, that is, such writings as were neuer brought forth into open light, and appoyned by authentical witnesse, written by others of olde time, which they alleged, and pretended to be as autentical as the true Scriptures, and would their Scho- lers to beleue, that they were written by the Apostles. This much maist thou find good Reader in the. 22. booke of S. Augustine, Contra Faustum Manichæum, in the 79. chapter, and not in the chapter. 80. as M. Jewel hath falsely quoted.

Aug. de ha-
resib. ad
Quod-
nult deum
har. 46. de
uolunt. cre-
dendi ad
honor. c. 2.
Ad Quod-
nult deum.
Aug. cōtra
Faust. lib.
11. cap. 2.

The summe of that I say, is this. By report of S. Augustine the Manichees had, and did read Secret & vnallowed scri- ptures, writtē vnder the name of the Apostles. That thei wrote such Scriptures or bookes them selues, this S. Augustine saith not. As for this booke of Abdias, or any part of it, that it should be written by the Manichees, and auouched by them, as the true storie of the Apostles: it can not be gathered by S. Augustine, that he did euer so much as once dreame of it.

But by examination of M. Jewels sayings, his falshed is to be detected. First he saith, that S. Augustine reporteth the fables of S. Thomas, S. Mathew, S. Andrew, of the Lion, of the Dogge, and of Maxi- milla, and other like tales, euen in such order, as they be set forth by this Abdias. If this be true M. Jewel, I am content Abdias be ta- ken for a fabler, which thing if it wer so, yet my answere to your challenge standeth in force, and is not yet by you disprooued. For I stande not vpon the auctoritie of Abdias, as I sayoe befoze,

Exami-
nation of
M. Jew.
vnto true
sayings.

A Reioindre to

neither haue I alleged him for private Masse, but as you knowe
for the Sacrifice in general.

*Augusti-
nus contra
Faustum.
lib. 22. cap
79. & co-
tra Adi-
mantum.
cap. 17.*

In deede S. Augustine speaketh of S. Thomas, how a
Lion had killed a man whom he cursed, for that he had striken
him on the head at a mariage dinner, and how a dogge brought
that mannes hande vnto the table. And al this is but one matter
which M. Iewel by putting in the names of S. Mathew, and
of S. Andrew, hath so diuided, and otherwise dilated, as
the Reader can conceiue none other, but that they are sundry
narrations. That which S. Augustine telleth of Maximilla
the wife of Egetes out of the Secrete Scriptures, is an other
matter. To these two I haue to answer.

*I false
deuise put
in by M.
Iewel.*

As for the fables of S. Mathew, and S. Andrew, I knowe
not what fables he meaneth. It is a thing deuised of his owne
fabling heade. Merely S. Augustine in those places reporteth
no such thing. But where M. Iewel lacked good matter, he
thought best to make vp a shew of somewhat though it neuer
were done, nor imagined to be done. That false deuise I leaue to
M. Iewel to answer vnto, and before al true men I charge him
with the false inuention of it. By this shuffling in the names of
S. Mathew and S. Andrew, he thought to discredit the Sacri-
fice of the Masse reported by them to haue ben done. He wil litle
spare to helpe me, I see wel, such that he sticketh not to helpe that
most learned and holy Father S. Augustine. what manner of lye
I shal cal this I wot not. But it is a very great falshed.

*Contra
Faustum
lib. 22. cap
79.
S. Au-
gustine spea-
keth of*

S. Augustine disputing against the Manichees, alleging
certain Secret and vnallowed scriptures, writte vnder the name
of the Apostles (of which sort the storie of Abdias is not, for it
beareth not the name of any Apostle, but of Abdias, and of
Iulius Africanus the interpreter) telleth, that it is written in a
booke of such scriptures, that S. Thomas the Apostle, at a ma-
riage

riage feast cursed a seruauit that had striken him on the head, which seruauit was slaine by and by of a Lion, as he went forth to a wel to draw water, and a dogge brought his hande being rent from the body to the table where ¶ Apostle sate. But as the holy Apostle by his curse procured him outward punishment of his person, so he prayed for him to be forgiven euerlastingly in the woꝛlde to come, whereby a recompense of a greater benefite was made.

This is that which ¶ Jewel calleth a false fable. And because the same is found in Abdias, he wil needes haue al to be false, what so euer is contained in that whole storie, touching the blessed Sacrifice of the Church. Now whereas ¶ Jewel allegeth ¶ Augustine for his purpose, reason would, he should follow ¶ Augustine, and not go beyond ¶ Augustine. This is a false fable saith ¶ Jewel, & to that purpose he calleth to witness ¶ Augustine. But ¶ Augustine refuseth so to say, Vtrū (saith he) illa vera sit aut conficta narratio, nihil me nunc interest. whether it be a true or a fained tale, here I force not. Againe within fewe lines, he refuseth to determine, siue hoc verum sit, siue confictum, whether this be true or fained. If he had thoughte it had ben a false fable, he would not so haue spoken of it. he leaueth it as a thing neither to be taken as a written truth of Scripture, nor as a manifest vnt ruth. I doubt not but who so euer shal weigh this indifferently, he wil assone incline to the modestie of ¶ Augustine, as to ¶ Jewels rashnes, who condemneth that, which ¶ Augustine would not condemne, but rather seemed to acknowledge for truth. For els whereto pertaine those woꝛdes, which he putteth there, Tenebat certe interius dilectionis affectum, & exterius requirebat correctionis exemplum, Verely ¶ Thomas inwardely kept the affect of loue, and outwardly required an example of correction: Fur-

such booke as beare the name of the Apostles of which I wrote this booke of Abdias is none.

¶ Augustine modestie, ¶ Jew. rashnes. ¶ Augustine seemeth to acknowledge this parte of Abdias storie to be true.

A Reioindre to

thermore there he saith, that by this example, the Manichees be compelled to acknowledge and graunt the vertue of patience to haue ben in the Apostle . It had ben vaine for S. Augustine to say thus, if he had thought al to be a lye, as M. Jewel doth.

Not what
so euer is
reported
in Secret
& vnkno-
wen scri-
ptures, is
to be este-
med as
false.

Ang. lib. 1.
cont. Ad-
uers. legis
& prophet.
cap. 20.

The most þ he can say in repprou of this thing, is þ it is repor-
ted in Secret & vnallowed Scriptures. This much I graunt. Yet
is not þ an argument to proue it to be a false fable. for in the Se-
crete Scriptures also, which are called Apocryphæ Scripturæ,
many thinges be tolde, that be true: as we find in Nicodemus
Gospel and in the booke named Pastor, which was in the Primi-
tine Church esteemed for the instruction of the learners of our
faith, almost equal with the Canonical Scriptures. Yea if al
thinges were to be cōdemned as vntreue, þ be wrytten in þ Secret
Scriptures, then should we condemne the most and chief partes
of the Gospel. Eui (saith S. Augustine) in Apocryphis aliqua
veritas inueniatur, tamen propter multa falsa aut suspecta, nulla est
Canonica auctoritas. As much to say. Although in the Secret
wrytinges some truth be found, yet because of many thinges
which be false, or suspect, there is in them no Canonical autho-
ritie. That Abdias be taken for Canonical scripture, therof I cō-
tend not. Things by him reported may be true, though his autho-
ritie be not canonical, that is to say, of auctoritie as the Scrip-
tures. wherefore sith this storie reported of S. Thomas, by
S. Augustins iudgment containeth example of patience, and of
charitie, and M. Jewel hath neither reason, nor learning wher-
by to proue it false: it is not against the dignitie of the Apostles,
that it be thought to be true, and that, notwithstanding any thig
in the same reported, Abdias, or rather Julius Africanus, be ad-
mitted to be read as a true wryter.

That a Secret booke of the actes of S. Thomas was
extant in olde time, it appeareth in that we finde by the storie of
his

his life. For whosoever was the author of it, he writeth of a booke wherein was declared his journey into India, and his doings there. But because the same was not received of some, for the superfluitie of wordes: he promisseth to omitte things that be of no effect, and to recorde those things, that be most certainly true, and acceptable to the readers, and may edifie the Church.

Lib. 9.

By this Author, what other things sener written in that booke were untrue, yet this narration of S. Thomas, of the Lion, and of the mannes hande, is accompted true. Yes whether they be true or no, it forceth not greatly. I am content to suspende my iudgement therein, as S. Augustine doth. As I thinke not good with vehement assenation to anonch it, so I dare not denie it. whether it be true or false, thereby the Catholike doctrine concerning the Sacrifice is not impugned, for witness whereof amonge many others, Abdias was alleged. Now to the other tale of Maximilla and Euclia.

this story
of S.
Thomas
anouched
to be true.

Iewel.

In an other place S. Augustine saith, Attendite qualia sint, quæ scribuntur de Maximilla vxore Egetis, illam noluisse viro debitum reddere, donasse & supposuisse Eucliam ancillam, & alias similes fabulas. Behold what things they be that be written of Maximilla, wife to Egetis that she (being once christened) would nomore yeld dutie to her husband, but set Euclia her maide in her owne place, and other like fables. * Al these and such like tales thus disallowed by S. Augustine, are reported by M. Hardings Abdias in great sooth.

Aug. de si-
de contræ
Manich.

cap. 30.
S. Iew,
falsifieth
S. Aug.
The 31-
vnttruth,
these tales
be not re-
ported by
Abdias.
let þ boke
be trial.

Harding.

First S. Jewels quotatio is false. This tale of Maximilla

L iij

wife

A Reioindre to

wife to Egetes (so) so of S. Augustine he is called and not E-
gis) is not touched of him in his booke de fide contra Maniche-
os cap. 30. but capite 38. Neither be these the wordes of S.
Augustine, which M. Jewel here hath put, but other, and other-
wise placed. Because if he had alleged the wordes as they be
in S. Augustine, they wold haue disclosed his falshe and dash-
ed his cause: he thought it better to vse his accustomed sleight
in falsifying the place, by chaunging the wordes, by cutting
some awaye, and by putting in other of his owne, that so he
might frame the whole to his purpose, then with plaine and
vpright dealing to allege the Doctor as he speaketh.

S. Aug.
findeth not
faute with
Abdias,
but one
Leucius.

*Au. de fide
contra Ma-
nichæos.
cap. 38.*

1. Cor. 7.

S. Augustines wordes be spoken specially vnto the Ma-
nichees, who regarded certaine Secrete Scriptures moze then
holy Scriptures. And in that place he telleth expressely, who
was the authoꝝ of this tale of Maximilla and Euclicia, not Abdias,
as, but one Leucius. His wordes begin thus. Attendite in ad-
ibus Leucij, quos sub nomine Apostolorū scribit, qualia sine quæ ac-
cipitis de Maximilla uxore Egetis: &c. Consider ye (saith S. Au-
gustine to the Manichees) in the actes of Leucius, which he writeth
vnder the name of the Apostles, what things they are, which ye
receiue touching Maximilla the wife of Egetes, which when as she
would not render dutie to her husband, whereas the Apostle hath
saide, Let the man render dutie to his wife, likewise also the
wife to her husband: She set her maide named Euclicia in her place,
decking her, as it is written there, with vnhousewifely trickes and
trinkets, and placing her in her own stede, to the intent he not wit-
ting of it, should lyewith her as with his wife. These be the very
wordes of S. Augustine there, as also certaine other declaring
very fond and vaine thinges to be written in that vnlawfull and
secret booke, called, ꝑ actes of Leucius, or rather of ꝑ Apostles writē
of

of Leucius vnder the name of the Apostles, which the Manichees so much esteemed.

Now if M. Jewel or any man of his side finde this fable of Maximilla, and this batworie of her reported in al the booke of Abdias: I wil say that in this point he is a true man, and hath great aduantage against Abdias. But if there be no such thing, nor likelihood of any such thing there, as I am sure there is not: then must it folowe that Abdias is not hereby disproued, and that M. Jewel is a great lyer, for saying these wordes, *Al these and such like tales thus disallowed by S. Augustine, are reported by M. Hardinges Abdias in great sooth.* what is impudent lying, if this be not?

By Abdias Maximilla is reported to haue ben a very godly woman, that she was a diligent hearer of S. Andretes preachings, that she buried his body after his Martyrdome, and that she continued a faithful woman. Of Euclia her maid, and of denying dutie to her husband contrarie to S. Pauls wordes, and of that filthy placing of her maide in her owne keede: in all Abdias there is not so much as one worde, nor is Euclia by him so much as once named. If any frende of M. Jewel beleue me not, let him peruse the storie of Abdias, and he shal fynde, whether of vs both is to be charged with this lowde lie. And if he be found a shamelesse lyer in this, why should he be credited in other pointes, wherein he goeth from the catholike Church: yet *al these (saith he) and such like tales thus disallowed by S. Augustine, are reported by M. Hardinges Abdias in great sooth.*

lib. 3. Abdias.
Maximilla what a woman she was by report of Abdias.

This is one of M. Jewels impudent lyes, that by no shift can be iustified.

If Leucius were Abdias, or if Abdias whom I alleged, were Leucius, and had written the thinges which S. Augustine repproueth as fables: then had M. Jewel some truth on his side. But now sith it is, as it is, his lye is to shamelesse, and by no colour can be couered, or excused. If he had me at this aduantage, both his booke should proclaime it to my discredit, and

A Reioindre to

Pauls crosse should ring of it. But with him I trowe men
beare the more, because he doth no otherwise, then he is wont
to do, As it shal hereafter further appeare.

Iewel:

The. 32.
vnto
S. Augu-
stine can
not seme
to wytte
thus of
Abdias.
August.

contra ad-
uersar. le-

gis & pro-
phet. lib. 1.

cap. 20.

This pla-
ce of S.

Augustin
speareth

of booke

set forth
vnder the

name of

S. Iohn,
& S. An-

drew, and
therefore it

perceineth
not to M.

Iewel: pur-
pose against
Abdias.

S. Augustine semeth in diuerse places to haue geuen his iudgement of
this booke, vriting against the aduersarie of the layve and prophetes, he
hath these vvordes. He hath brought forth vvittnesses out of Secrete scrip-
tures vnder the names of the Apostles, Iohn and Andrew, vvich vwritinges
if they had ben theirs, they had ben receiued of the Church.

Harding:

What meaneth M. Iewel to allege this place of S. Augu-
stine? what maketh it against Abdias? would he men to
thinke that S. Augustine meant, that Abdias hath brought forth
witnesses out of Secrete Scriptures, or that the boke of Abdias
is that, which S. Augustin calleth secrete scriptures there? If M.
Jewel thought to make me beleue that, the should he haue vsed
his olde crafte, and clipped away from the sentence, those vvordes
of S. Augustine, sub nominibus Apostolorum Andreae Iohannisq;
conscripta, whereby he doth al men to vnderstand, that those Te-
stimonies which the heretike brought forth in his booke, were
said to be vvritten vnder the names of the Apostles S. Andrew,
and S. Iohn.

Now neither the booke that beareth the name of Abdias,
or rather of Iulius Africanus the Translatour and disposer of
it, as it appeareth, nor no parte of it, is set forth vnder the
names of those Apostles S. Andrew and S. Iohn. And therefore
this place of S. Augustine serueth M. Jewel to no purpose, but
only

only to dase the eyes of them, that can not wel discern his false straightes.

For I graunt, if the thinges in that booke witten, had ben witten by S. Andrew and S. John, then doubtles the Church had receiued them as holy scriptures.

But as here M. Jewel alleged a prete of a Sentence out of S. Augustine, which he would seme to serue his purpose, and serueth not in deede: so would God he had alleged the whole Sentence, as it is witten of S. Augustine, and would allow and beleue the same, which evidently ouerthroweth al his and his selowes false doctrine. The sentence is this.

Quæ si illorum essent, recepta essent ab Ecclesia, quæ ab illorum temporibus per Episcoporum successiones certissimas, usque ad nostra & deinceps tempora perseverat. &c. If these testimonies had ben theirs, (S. Andrewes and S. Johns) they had ben receiued of the Church, which Church contineweth by most certaine successions of Bishops, from their time to our time, and so afterward. &c.

Augustinus ibidem
By S. Augustine the church continueth by most certaine successions of bishops. wher the is this newe Germanian Church

In which wordes S. Augustine doth acknowledge the continuance of the Church by most certaine successions of bishops, from the Apostles time forwarde to the ende of the worlde. These wordes are wel to be noted, which being true, do proue these new Gospellers Doctrine to be false, and their Congregation to be no Church of Christe, but the Synagogue of Antichriste. For they are not habile to proue the continuance either of their Doctrine, or of their Church, by successions of Bishops, which by S. Augustines iudgement ought to be most certaine.

But what continuance of successions of Bishops can they shewe for proufe of their Church, who acknowledge

A Reioindre to

it to haue ben begon by Martine Luther, and Buldyke Zwinglius about fifty yerres past, as in the Apologie of their church they protest, and haue no number of bishops to shewe, in whom and by whom their successions haue alwayes continewed: Of this mater I haue spoken in my Confutation of their Apologie: to the places where I treate thereof I remit the reader. But let nothing passe that M. Jewel bringeth for disproufe of Abdias, least he charge me with vnttrue dealing, as I charge him. In his Replie thus it foloweth.

In the
Confutati
on. fol. 15,
b. 42. 57. a
119. b. 8c.

Ieyuel.

The like iudgement hereof semeth to be geuen by * Gelasius, vvhoe also saith that such writings, according to an auuicent custome, and by a singular prouision, were not reade in the church of Rome, for that they were thought to be written by heretikes.

The 11.
vnttruth.
Gelasius
meaneth
no such
thing tou-
ching Ab-
dias.

Harding.

Gelasius
maketh no
direct
proufe a-
gainst Ab-
dias.

Distin-
ct. 15
Sancti Ro-
mana.

Seming and being is not one. If al were true, that to M. Jewel semeth true, then were many Heresies true doctrines, many lyes true reportes. Neither saith Gelasius, as M. Jewel allegeth him. He speaketh of certaine actes of Martyrs written by men, whose names he not knowen, which were thought to be written by Infidels. and there he nameth the passions of one Quiricus, and of Iulita his mother. Also certaine other thinges, as the passions of S. George, and of others, quæ ab hæreticis probantur conscriptæ, which passions are tried out (saith Gelasius) to haue ben written by heretikes. But seing that the boke of Abdias is neither thought to be written by Infidels, nor tryed to be written by Heretikes, as neither Maister Jewel nor any of his syde can proue it: the place of Gelasius maketh nothing for his purpose. And so Abdias may be reade of catho-
like

like men, as Gelafius there would certaine writings to be read with this caution and promise, that when they come to catholike mennes hands, the sentence of the most blessed Apostle S. Paule goe before, Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete, Proneye al things, kepe that which is good. Here wil I put in M. Iewels conclusion touching Abdias, and then an ende of this mater.

Iewel.

Thus is this Abdias a booke as it is apparent, full of manifest lyes, and as it may be supposed * by S. Augustine and Gelafius, written and saoured by Heretikes, and refused of the church: vpon such a one, good reader, M. Harding wil haue thee to stay thy faith.

Harding.

Thus hath M. Iewel neither proued Abdias to haue written so much as one lye, much lesse to be full of manifest lyes: nor can it iustly be supposed by S. Augustine or Gelafius, that the booke is written or saoured by heretikes. Neither wil I thee good reader to stay thy whole faith chiefly vpon Abdias, nor to that purpose did I allege him: but only, for that he seemed very auncient, by his testimonie, as by many others, to shewe vnto the studious Reader, where to finde mention made of the vnbloody Sacrifice of the Church, and of the celebration of the holy Mysteries. which thing is otherwise so wel proued, that we neede not the witnesse of Abdias. whether his auctoritie be admitted or refused, to me it skilleth little. Only I thought good to shewe, that for any thing M. Iewel hath yet said, who hath both in his Replie written, and at Pauls Crosse scoffed much at him, he is not iustly disproued.

As for thy faith good reader, I aduise thee not to staie it vpon

M. I.

Abdias,

The. 34.
vnto truth.
I burthen
of vnto
thes, nei-
ther by S.
Augustin
nor by Ge-
lafius, is
this sup-
posed, as
now I
haue pro-
ued.

A Reioindre to

Abdias, nor vpon M. Iewel, nor vpon me: but vpon the worde of God, that is to say, vpon that Doctrine which the holy Ghost hath taught the Catholike Church, and vpon those and other holy Fathers, so farre as their doctrine agreeth with the doctrine of the Catholike Church, which Church as S. Paule saith, is the pillour and sure stay of truth. And this much hitherto of Abdias. Now let vs see what M. Iewel bringeth for disproufe of certaine other doctours by me alleged for the Sacrifice of the Church.

Of S. Martialis.

Iewel.

The. 35.
but truth,
It could
be read,
eis how
could it be
printed

Martialis was lately founde in Fraunce in the Citie of Lemonica, in an arche of stone vnder the grounde, so corrupte and defaced, that in many places it could not be reade, and was neuer sene in the worlde at any time before.

Harding.

If S. Martialis booke of Epistles could not haue ben read, it could not haue ben printed. M. Iewel found it thus written of those Epistles, præ nimia vetustate vix legi poterant, for very oldenesse they could scantly be reade: and by making a type for aduantage, he had rather say it could not be reade. So by his profession oftentimes somewhat is made nothing, and nothing is made somewhat. That it was neuer sene in the worlde at any time before, it is rather said then proued. Berth Gregorius Turonensis an auncient wyter recordeth, that S. Martialis was sent to be bishop to them of Lemonica, and that he lyued in great holinesse, and after that he had wonne many folkes to the Church, and set abrode the faith of Christ, he departed this life

In libro
apud Hen-
ricū Petri
Basilea-
dito, anno.
1555.
Historia-
rum lib. 1.
cap. 30.

in a blessed confession. In the booke intituled Orthodoxographia printed at Basile, where M. Jewels Sacramentarie doctrine was specially taught by Frere Oecolampadius commonly named Frere Huskin, the iudgement of a learned man concerning S. Martialis Epistles is declared with these wordes. The two Epistles of Martialis seme to be written at the imitation of S. Paule. Verely they be worthy to be reade, they are founde to fauer of the spirite of God. who despyeth to see moze of S. Martialis, may he reade Antonius Demochares. tom. 2. cap. 25. Petrus de Natalibus. lib. 6. cap. 29. Henricus Mauroy in prima parte Apologiz pro Iudæis in Archiepiscopum Toletanum. cap. 34.

Of S. Dionysius the Areopagite.

level.

Dionysius althoughe he be an auncient vvriter as it may many vvaies vvel appeare, yet it is iudged by Erasmus * Iohn Colet, and others many graue and learned men, that it can not be Areopagite S. Pauls disciple, that is mentioned in the Actes.

Harding.

The wordes of S. Dionysius be so plaine for the blessed Sacrifice of the church, for which I alleged him, that M. Jewel not being hable by any shifte to auoide them, thought best to diminish his auctoritie. And therefore though he confesse him to be an auncient vvriter, for which he is worthy no thanks, yet is he loth to take him for the Areopagite S. Pauls scholer. That it is not he, it may be iudged (saith he) by Erasmus, Iohn Colet, and others many graue and learned men. If it be so, why did he not allege them? why doth he not tel vs who they be, and where they pronounce such iudgment of S. Dionysius?

M. iij

Truly

The. 36.
vntuth.
It is not
so iudged
by Iohn
Colet.

The. 37.
vntuth.
There be
no such
graue and
learned
men.

A Reioindre to

Here M. Jewel bringeth not forth his *Summers*, but telleth vs of *Summers*. Truly that is but a common shift of his, when authorities and euident proufes faile him, yet to pretende number, where one moe can not be named. As for John Collet, he hath neuer a worde to shew, for he wrote no workes. If he said it at his table, or in a sermon, as M. Jewel perhappes hath heard saye: the proufe is of small auctoritie. we admit not the trial of hearesaies. As for Erasmus iudgement, we see it not greatly esteemed among the best learned men, either for sundry his censures of wyrters, or for any weighty point of learning besides touching Diuinitie.

John Collet.

Erasmus.

Petrus
Martyr in
comment.
in 1. Cor.
15. fol. 413.
That S.
Dionysius
was the
Areopagite,
S.
Paulus
scholer.

But M. Jewel I suppose, by his graue and learned men meaneth Bale, Hooper, Cranmare, Caluine, Peter Martyr, and such others of that syde. For Peter Martyr would not this S. Dionysie to be the Areopagite S. Paulus Disciple, but some other of later age. Neither is it likely (saith he) his workes to haue ben much esteemed in old time, seing that beside Gregory a Latine man, none of the olde fathers euer alleged them. How true this is, shal wel it shal appeare vnto the Reader, that listeth to reade that auncient Doctoz Origen. homilia. 2. in diuersos. where he is cited, and named Magnus Dionysius Areopagita, great Dionysie the Areopagite.

Origenes wordes be these, after the Latine translation. In ipso enim vt os loquitur diuinum, viuimus, mouemur, & sumus: & vrait Magnus Dionysius Areopagita, esse omnium est superessentialia, & diuinitas. In Greke thus. τὸ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐστὶν, ἡ ὑπὲρ τὸ ὕψος θεία. i. esse omnium est super essentialiam diuinitas. These wordes are to be founde in S. Dionysius, Caelestis Hierarchia. cap. 4. The auncient Father Dionysius Alexandrinus wrote Annotations vpon the workes of S. Dionysius Areopagita, which be alleged by Maximus and Pachymeres, in their greke bryefe

by these Commentaries. The learned Fathers assembled at the Council of Constantinople allege this auncient father, calling him S. Dionysie the Areopagite Bishop of Athens. Of him also speaketh Liberatus an olde wytter, Breuiarij cap. 10.

So he is alleged of Damascenus de orthodoxa fide. lib. 3. cap. 6. where he is named by expresse wordes, Pauli discipulus, deiser, & circa diuina plurimus, Dionysius Areopagita. S. Pauls disciple, the godly and great Diuine, Dionysius the Areopagite. Of S. Gregorie he is called, Dionysius Areopagita antiquus & venerabilis pater. Dionysie Areopagite, the auncient and reuerent father. In euangelia. homil. 34.

And how can he seme to any man but very auncient, sith that he wrote certaine thinges to S. Timothee S. Pauls scholar, to Tite and Caius, and to S. John the Euangelist: To proue his antiquitie, and that he was S. Pauls disciple the Areopagite, If I thought it nedeful, and thereby should not to wise men seme ambitious, I would here allege no smal number of good authorities both of Beke and Latine wytters. These few now may wel suffice. So then is S. Dionysius Areopagita S. Pauls disciple an vnccontrolled witness of the blessed Sacrament, and such as M. Jewel, nor any other Sacramentarie can take exception against.

Of S. James Masse, or Liturgie.

S. James Liturgie hath a special prayer for them that live in Monasteries: and yet it was very rathe to haue Monasteries built in a. S. James time.

Harding.

A man can not wel tel, where to haue M. Jewel. For here he condemneth the auctoritie of S. James Masse or Liturgie, as a thing forged, and none of his, for that he hath a special prayer

N i

for

The. 38.
vnterth.
There is
no mentio
of such mo
nasteries,
as we co
monly
meane,
when we
speake of
monaste
ries.

A Reioindre to

M. Jew. for them (as he saith) that liue in Monasteries. which he supposeth both alloweth & disalloweth **S. James Masse** not to haue ben builde so rathe. And within a fewe sentences in the very same side of the lease, as though he had forgotten him selfe, he alloweth **S. James Luggie**, and allegeth it for prouise of the Communion. Likewise in y^e printed Sermon of his Chalége he sticketh not to name it **S. James Masse**, and taketh y^e same as of good auctoritie, wher he saith expressly, y^e **S. James** said his Masse

M. Jew. in the comon tongue, as the people might vnderstand him, which is more veridite of **S. James Masse** than he is able to proue, for it is writte in greke, which was not y^e peoples vulgare tongue of Ierusalem. Item y^e **S. James Masse** was full of knowlledge. That vwhen **S. James** said Masse, the people resorted to receiue the sacrament. That **S. James** in his Masse had Christes Institution. Al this saith he there. Yet here because I alleged it for witness of the Sacrifice, he reiecteth it, for hauing mention of Monasteries. Thus he admitteth and refuseth what him listeth, as any thing maketh for him, or against him.

But if he be tolde, that **S. James** maketh no special prayer for them that lyue in Monasteries after his meaning, as truth it is that he doth not: what hath he then to say? what other Christe will he deuise? For **S. James Masse** must not be admitted, what euer he said, because thereby the vndisputed Sacrifice is anouched. And not only that, but also prayer vnto our Lady **S. Mary**, and prayer for the dead. If he meane by the name of Monasteries, such houses of religious men and women, as the spirit of their newe gospel hath of late yeres throtten downe in sundry places of Christendome: as I graunt that such were not so rathe builde, I meane as they be considered with their rich endowmentes, landes, and all commodities, as we haue sene in England, so I affirme that **S. James** speaketh neuer a worde of them. Perhaps that he might seme to say somewhat against whatsoeuer is bygged for prouise of the Sacrifice, he was content to abuse some

Latine

S. James Masse is quite contrary to the new Gospel. Monasteries.

Latine translation, whereas the Breke original hath no such thing at al.

In dede S. James in his Masse of Liturgie maketh a prayer for them that live in *ἀσκησι*, that is to say, in exercise. Neither prayeth he only for them in that special prayer, but also for them that live in virginittie, in chastitie, in reverend wedlocke, for them that lived hardly in hills, in denues, in holes of the earth, the holy Fathers and brethren.

What is meant by exercise, I trow M. Jewel is not ignorant, though he know neither the thing, nor them that profess it. It signifieth that order of life, which they leade that sequester them selves from worldly affaires and cares; and apply their whole mynde and studie to the service of God. And because men may with grace so do, though they live not in monasteries of welthy provision, such as we have sene Monkes of England live in: therefore it is not necessary to understand the place of S. James Masse of them, that lived in monasteries, but of them, that lived (as Monkes then lived) solitarily, in the exercise of vertue, not having to do with the world. These were called *ἀσκηται* the menne, *ἀσκητρίαι* the women, *ἀσκητήρια* the places, celles, or houses, where they lived.

Exercise
what it
signifieth.

How the
place of
S. James
Masse is
to be un-
derstande.

Yet am not I ignorant that in S. James time of whose Masse I speake, there were holy places called *μοναστήρια* monasteries, but they were not such as M. Jewel would the vulgar people to understand, for the avoiding of S. James auctoritie alleged for the Sacrifice of the Masse.

Monasteries in the
Apostles
time.

For Philo the Jewe who wrote in the Apostles time, in his booke de vita contemplativa supplicum, as Eusebius allegeth, speaking of the first Christians that lived in Egypte, saith that in every place where a companie dwelled together, they had a holy house, which they called *οἶκος καὶ μοναστήριον*.

Histor.
eccles. lib.
2. cap. 17.

A Reioindre to

as much to say in English, as a Church, which wordes properly as by Philo we are instructed, haue their sound of that men wēt a side from other worldly companie, where they exercised and kept the mysteries of chaste and holy life. Unto which places they brought neither meate nor drinke, nor any other thinges pertaining to the seruice of mannes bodye, but bookes of the lawe and prophetes, of hymnes and prayers, and such others, whereby knowledge and godlynesse are encreased and perfited. If M. Jewel wil vnderstand the worde Monasteries which he founde in his Latine translation of S. James Masse after this sense, then I say it was not to rathe to haue Monasteries in S. James time.

Thus haue we cleared S. James Masse of M. Jewels slander Obiection. The auctoritie and credite of it is sufficiently a-
Sexta sy-
nodi. ca. 32 nounced by the auncient father Hieronimus bishop of Constantino-
 ple, and specially by the sixth general Councel holden in Trullo.
 wherfore the Sacrifice of the Masse is approued by testimonie of
 S. James Masse, and so remaineth vnshaken, notwithstanding
 M. Jewels colourable Replie.

Of S. Chrysostomes Masse or Liturgie.

Ieruel,

The. 39. 130
 vnto truth.
 He prai-
 eth not for
 Pope Ni-
 colas of
 Rome.
The. 40.
 vnto truth.
 for there
 was no
 such wo-
 ma Pope
 at al.

The. 41.
 vnto truth.
 I say not
 this much

Chrysostomes Liturgie prayeth for Pope Nicolas by these wordes:
 Nicolas Sanctissimi & vniuersali Papa long a fuit tempora. We praye God
 sende Nicolas that most holy and vniuersal Pope a long time to liue. But
 Pope Nicolas the first of that name, was the second Pope after Pope
 Iohane the yoman, in the yere of our Lorde eight hundred fiftie and seuen,
 almost fise hundred yeres after Chrysostome was dead. And likewise in
 the same Liturgie there is a prayer for the Emper, and victorie of the Em-
 perour Alexius. And the first Emperour of that name was in the yere of
 our Lorde a thousand and foure score, after the decesse of Chrysostome se-
 uen hundred yeres. Now it were very much for M. Harding to say
 Chrysostome prayed for men by name seuen hundred yeres before they were
 borne.

borne. I trow that vvere prophesying, and not praying.

Harding.

As M. Jewel condemneth S. James Liturgie of Masse, so he condemneth also S. Chrysostomes, not being hable by other shifte to auoide the manifest testimonies for the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christ there mentioned. But the mater is sone answered. The Liturgie hath alwayes ben put among the workes of S. Chrysostome, and was neuer doubted to be his by any learned man. Erasmus hath translated it into Latine, and calleth it S. Chrysostomes Masse. The words of M. Jewel allegeth, by which it seemeth not to be his, be not found in the Liturgie, that is printed with the rest of his workes. In the translation of Erasmus there is put in no such mention of Pope Nicolas, nor of Alexius the Emperour, wherefoze of good right, we ought rather to denye M. Jewels allegation, then S. Chrysostomes Liturgie.

S. Chrysostomes Masse, is not disproved by ought that M. Jewel saith.

But let vs graunt y some Masse booke of copies of that Liturgie, haue a prayer for Nicolas, & an other for Alexius. Let it also be graunted, y they both liued vii. C. yeres after S. Chrysostome. what inconuenience foloweth hereof? Is not the death of Moyses described in the bookes of the lawe, called of the number of fiue bookes, Pentateuchus? Yet is there no man so hardy as to denye, that Moyses wrote those bookes. And is it likely that a man should describe the order and manner of his owne death and burial? Answer me how this may be M. Jewel, and I wil answer you, how in the Masse of Liturgie of S. Chrysostome, a prayer might be made for Nicolas, and for Alexius, though they liued seuen hundred yeres after S. Chrysostome. Yea but (saith M. Jewel) it were very much for me to say, Chrysostome prayed for men by name seuen hundred yeres before they were borne. For he thinketh that to be prophesying, and not praying. That were much, and

R ii

ouer

A Reioindre to

ouer much in dede for me to say, I graunt. Neither say I so. But that the names of men that were bozne a thousand yeres after S. Chrysostome, were put in the Masse of Liturgie of S. Chrysostome, for me so to say: it were neither much, nor unreasonable. And who so euer at his Masse prayeth for such, whose names he fyndeth written in the Masse booke, though the Masse were first indigthed by one a thousand yeres before, the same dothe praiſe, and not prophesie.

How it
may be ſe
in S.
Chryſoſto-
mes maſſe
Nicolae &
Alexius, &
liued long
after S.
Chryſoſto-
mes time,
were prai-
ed for.

Now whereas M. Jewel ſaith, Chrysostomes Liturgie prayeth for Nicolas and Alexius, if he meane that S. Chrysostome him ſelfe prayed for them at his Maſſe, he belpeth him, for they liued long after him. But if he meane by the Liturgies prayer, the putting in of the names of Nicolas and Alexius into the booke of the Liturgie, by ſight whereof the Priest ſaith Chrysostomes Maſſe, is admoniſhed to pray for the: ſo Chrysostomes Liturgie may and doth pray for Hoſaph, that at this day is Patriarke of Conſtantinople, and no abſurditie therein is graunted: for it may be, that his name is written in that place of the Maſſe, where the liuing are remembred and prayed for, As I my ſelfe haue ſene a Maſſe booke where king Henry the eight his name was written, and yet was the Maſſe made many yeres before he was bozne.

Such as be learned, be not ignorant of the auncient and long continued cuſtome of the Church, which was, that the names of the chiefe Biſhops and Princes, both when they liued, and after their deceaſſe, were in all ages regiſtered in rolles, Diptycha, bookes, or tables, which the antiquitie called Diptycha, to thint they might be remembred and reherſed in the dyedſul Myſteries. Now according to the diuerſitie of times diuerſe names were put in. And in ſome places it is founde that S. Chrysostomes owne name was written in ſome auncient booke of his Liturgie

turgie, and was among others rehearsed after his death. Now for that cause M. Jewel may not scoffe, and say it were much for me to say, that Chrysostome lyuing, remembred Chrysostome departed. This much if M. Jewel knewe, it was malice to icast at Chrysostomes Masse, as he doth. If he knewe not, then is he very vnskillfull, and therefore ought not so much to presume of his owne part, nor be credited of others.

Neither was Nicolas, which is named in the Latine translation, that Claudius de Saintes hath set forth, Pope or bishop of Rome first of that name, as M. Jewel full ignorantly indgeth. He was a Patriarke of Constantinople, at that time when Alexius the first was Emperour, as it appeareth by conference of the Registres of the Patriarkes and Emperours there. That he is called Papa, it maketh no argument, that he was bishop of Rome. For that name was common to other bishops, as euery where it is reade. The name Vniuersal, obtained by ambitious vsurpation of the Patriarkes of that See, and by flatterie of the Clergo. Neither is Nicolas only in that place of the Latine Translation named, but also the thre other Patriarkes of the Orient. Euthenius of Alexandria, Cyrillus of Antiochia, and Leontius of Ierusalem, who lyued in one time. The bishop of Rome is not named at al, because they of Constantinople at that time had diuided them selues from the Church of Rome, and lyued in schisme.

If M. Jewel had looked in the Greke Liturgie, he had not founde the names of Nicolas, and the rest expressed. But a signification geuen by ὁ ἱερεὺς, and by this rubricke ὁ τὸς ἀνὴρ as much to say, such a one, and who so euer he be. wherby is meant that the Priest who saith Masse, put in and rehearse such names, as his dutie, time, and place requireth.

M. Jewel
anoucheth
an vn-
truth ei-
ther of vs
skill of
malice.

Nicolas
patriarke.
and Alexi-
us Empe-
rour of
Constanti-
nople
at one
time.
Papa.

Vniuersa-
lu.

The schi-
me of the
East
Church.

A Reioindre to

The Latines in such a case vse to put the letter, N. which stādeth indifferently for any name, whose so euer it be.

Leo
Thuscus
the trans-
latour of
the Greke
Masle.

That the names of Nicolas, and of the other three Patri-
arkes, and of Alexius, were put in the Latine translation, it is
to be attributed to one Leo Thuscus, who being at Constanti-
nople, turned the Masse of S. Chrysostome which the Grekes do
vse, into the Latine tongue, at the request of a noble man named
Rainaldus de monte Catano, who at the same time arrived there.
Because he founde those names in the booke, out of which he
made his translation, he left them also in the Latine: that his
translation should not varie from his Greke exemplar. If he
had fallen vpon an other booke, that had had other names, he
had put in other names, as he that purposed not to go from his
exemplar.

Pope Ioan.

In the 4.
parte fol.
164. a

Touching Pope Ioane the woman, whom it liked M. Je-
wel of his good deuotion here to name in the texte, and to place
in the margent of his booke with great text letters, that euery
mannes eye might thereby be moued to looke that waye: how
vaine a fable it is, I haue declared in my Confutation of the
English churches Apologie at large. By such fables they study
how to lead the people from the loue and obedience of the church,
out of which Church they be assured to finde no other but euera-
sing damnation. Thus thou seest Christian Reader, what so
euer testimonie is alleged out of S. Chrysostomes Masse of Li-
turgie for proufe of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the same to be
good, for so much as the aucthoritie and estimation of it, is not a-
ny whit impaired, by any thing M. Jewel hath brought to the
contrary. And yet now he vpbraideth me, and craketh, as
though he had made a great conquest. But of such bad fuel ri-
seth more smoke then flame, Thou seest how iust cause I haue to
require him to subscribe,

Iewel.

Jewel.

Thou seest Christian Reader, what Doctors here be brought, as M. Harding saith, to grounde thy faith and * saluation vpon. If he could haue brought any better, I troue he vvould haue spared these. But such doctrine such Doctours. These doubtful authorities, I trust vvill set mennes consciences out of doubt.

The 42.
vnttruth.
I say it
not.

Harding.

Read my wordes good Reader, and thou shalt fynde them to repoze no moze, but that I gaue a taste as it were of proues, without allegation of the wordes, for confirmation of thy faith concerning the Sacrifice. Concerning the Doctors, they be so muche the moze to be belued, how much M. Jewel is farre from iuste reponse of them. And what meaneth he? For any doctrine to be anonched, can better authoritie be brought, then the testimonie of the Scriptures, of Apostles, and Apostolike me & of most auncient & best learned Fathers? These Doctors I am not ashamed of. Howe could I haue named (for who speaketh not of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist) but these I thought to be sufficient both for number of persones, and for weight of sentence.

Fol. 11.

Neither I trust wil any man feareth God, and is stedfast in the faith, chaunge his conscience touching this point, though Mysteries be of these Doctors treated and spoken of as becommeth Mysteries, that is to saye, not in moste plaine wise. Among all thinges pertainyng to Christian faith, the whole matter of this blessed Sacrament, hath euery of the fathers ben rather honoured with the holynesse of secrete conscience and silence, then with much and euident declaratio set forth to the multitude. And the Doctrine of it hath ben kept by tradition, and custome, moze then by expresse writing. Of very religio Fathers forbare either to speake openly, or to write many words of it. S. Paule

The doctrine of mysteries hath ben kept rather by secrete tradition, then by publike writing.

Q

being

A Reioindre to

ing about to speake therof, demeaneth him selfe very warely, and prepareth the minds of the Corinthians to a depe consideration, & inniteth them to thinke of it, rather then to talke of it, with these wordes put for a preface, before he make expresse mention of it.

1. Cor. 10 Vt prudentibus loquor. I speake as vnto them which be wise, iudge ye what I say. Is not the cuppe of blessing, which we blesse, partaking of the Bloude of Christe? Is not the Breade, &c.

Likewise when the Fathers made mention of it, commonly they added a shoyt preface, thereby geuing warning, that they spake of a Myserie. Origen thus: He that is indued with the Myseries, knoweth the Flesh and Bloud of the worde of God. wherefore let vs not tarry (saith he) in these thinges, which vnto them that knowe, be knowne, and vnto them that knowe not, can not be open. S. Chrysostome thus. They that haue taken the Myseries, vnderstand what thinges are spoken. The comparteners of the Myseries knowe what is said. We that be Christened, let vs folowe, what thinges are spoken, the faithfull knowe.

Origenes
homil. 9. in
Leuiticū.

Chrysosto.
hom. de S.
Philogonio
homil. 51.
ad pop. An
tiochen. 61.

In prima
inuestitia
in Iulianū
Ad Hero-
nem.

S. Gregorie Nazianzen hauing occasion to speake of this thing sayth by way of complaine. Heu in quales sermones incidere cogor? Alas what manner of talke am I driuen to fall into? Synesius that eloquent bishop, to signifie the secretnes of this Myserie, calleth it *τὸ μυστήριον* & *ἀπόρρητον*. as much to say, the holy vn-speakeable Ceremonie. To note the like sayings out of S. Augustine, and the other Fathers, it were in manner infinite.

Heb. 5.

The notable worde of S. Paule is not to be passed over. who hauing touched Christes Priesthod after the order of Melchisedech, saith thus. De quo nobis grandis sermo, & ininterpretabilis ad dicendum, quoniam imbecilles facti estis ad audiendum. whereof we haue many thinges to say, which are harde to be uttered: because Ye are weake to heare them.

Forasmuch then as it hath pleased the holy Ghost, that this
great

greate secreete should not be uttered in most euident and open manner, M. Jewel doth great wrong vnto these holy Mysteries, in that he doth with al his witte and cunning endenour to with-
dawe vblearned folke from the faith in which the Church hath alwaies continued to this time, concerning the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, because the Fathers haue not in their writings set it forth so plainly, as to their grosse senses it might appear manifest, without any doubtfulness or obscuritie. As for the authoritie of the Doctours by me alleged, how sufficient they are, it appeareth by that M. Jewel hath laboured to deface them, and hath shewed in disprouing them, but the vanitie of his witte, and the malice of his purpose, which is utterly to abrogate the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Church.

Jewel.

How be it if al these be vittnesse to the masse, why speake they not? why come they forth dumme? what? haue they nought to say in this behalfe? Or is their worde not worth the hearing? Or are they so old, that they can not speake? Or must we needs beleue M. Harding without euidence?

Harding.

Here be a number of vaine interrogations al tending to one meaning. One had ben ynough. And here to turne to you M. Jewel, sir vpon what confidence shew you al this malapertnes? I thought you with this courage of words to persuaue your fauorable Readers, that the holy Doctours of the Church be dumme, as much to say, out of whom no worde can be alleged for witnesse of the vnbloudy Sacrifice? Seeing then by M. Jewels impoptunitie I am dymen to it, listen Reader, whether they be dumme or no.

M. Jewel.
malapert
calling for
the fa-
thers al-
legations
for prouise
of the Sa-
crifice.

Places vittnesing the Sacrifice of the Aulter.

Saith not Saincte Clement, that Christe for the bloudie Sacrifice (of the Olde Lawe) hath ordeyned
D n a reaso-

A Reioindre to

λογικὴν
symbola
Clemens
Apostolic.
institut.
lib. 6. ca. 23

a reasonable, vnbloudy, and mystical Sacrifice, which is celebrate in remembraunce of our Lordes death by the signes or tokens of his Body and Bloude? What other Sacrifice is this then the Eucharist, which we speake of?

Saide not S. Andrew to Egeas the Lieutenant of Achaia, as Philactetus reciteth out of the recordes of the Bpiskopes of Achaia, Immaculatum Agnum quotidie in altari sacrificio, I offer daily the vnspotted Lambe on the aulter?

In praefatione de traditione diuina Missae. Sexta Synodi ca. 32

The Liturgie of Masse reported to be S. James by Proclus Patriarke of Constantinople, by the learned Fathers of the sixth Councel, by the Greeke Bpishops Nicolaus of Methone, Marcus of Ephesus, Bessarion Patriarke of Constantinople, saith it not: I am vnworthy to cast myne eyes vpon this holy and spiritual table, on which the onely begotten Sonne our Lorde Iesus Christ, to me which am a sinner, and al bespotted, is mystically set forth to be a Sacrifice?

Martialis

Sayeth not S. Martialis in his Epistle ad Burdegalenses, We offer the Body and Bloude of Christe vnto lyfe euerlasting? Againe, saith he not, We propone on the Sanctified aulter for cause of our health, that thing, which the Iewes haue offered, thinking to abolish his name quite from the earth?

Clemens
Constitut.
lib. 3. ca. 17

Doth not S. Clement set forth a forme of Masse not much different from the Masse commonly vsed in the Latine Church touching the substance of it? which as to rehearse here were long, so would it liuely declare the antiquitie of the chief partes of the Masse.

Cyrillus in
Catechesi
mytagogi
ca. 5.

Do we not finde the like in S. Cyrillus Bpishop of Ierusalem Catechesi Mystagogica. 5? saith he not thus where he describeth the Consecration: We beseeche God to sende forth the Holy Ghost vpon the thinges set forth, that he make the bread the Body of Christ, the Wine the Bloud of Christ? For what soeuer

uer the holy ghost toucheth, it is sanctified and changed.

Then after that that spiritual Sacrifice is made, and the vn-
bloody worship vpon the hoste it selfe of propitiation, we pray to
God for the common peace of the Church, for the tranquil-
litie of the Worlde. &c. Againe saith he not there, that the praier
of the holy and dredful Sacrifice, which is layde on the aulter, is
offered for the deade? what Sacrifice is that but the Sacrifice
of the body and bloud of Christ? Thus S. Cyillus there, and
much moze for witnesse of this holy Sacrifice.

Saith not S. Dionysie S. Pauls discipule and Areopagite *Dionysius in Ecclesi-
ast. Hie-
rarch. lib.
1. cap. 3.
part. 3.* speaking of this Sacrifice, that the Venerable Priest or Bishop
standing at the holy aulter, after praises of Gods workes, re-
querently and according to his Byshoply office excuseth him selfe
for offering that healthful Sacrifice, which is aboue his dignitie,
First crying vnto him, (he meaneth Christ) thou hast saide, Hoc
facite in meam commemorationem, Do ye this in my remem-
braunce?

Saith not S. Iustine the Philosopher and Martyr, that *Iustinus in
dialogo cū
Tryphone
cōtra Iu-
daeos.* God witnesseth al the Sacrifices, which Christe commaunded to
be done in the Eucharist of the Breade and Cuppe, that are made
in al places, to be acceptable vnto him? Woth he not allege þe Pro-
phetic of Malachie against Trypho the Jewe, for proufe therof?

Saith not S. Irenaeus that blessed Martyr, speaking of
this Mysterie, that Our Lorde saide of the consecrated breade, *Irenaeus
cōtra he-
res. lib. 4.
cap. 32.* it was his Body, and confessed the Wine to be his Bloude,
and taught the newe Oblation of the newe Testament, which
the Church receiuing of the Apostles, offereth to God ouer the
whole worlde?

Saith not S. Basile in his Liturgie, Receiue vs O God ap- *Basilius in
Liturgia.* proching to thy holy aulter, according to the multitude of thy
mercie, that we may be worthy to offer vp vnto thee this reaso-
nable

A Reioindre to

nable & vnbloudy Sacrifice for our sins, & the peoples ignorance:

what shal I allege S. Chrysostome, whose testimonies for the Sacrifice gathered together, would fill a whole booke? Of many let one suffice. His wordes be these, which cannot be vnderstanded, but onely of the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloud of Christe.

*Chrysost.
homil. 2. in
2. ad Ti-
moth.*

I wil tel you a certaine thing more, that in dede is maruei-
lous, and marueil not at it, nor trouble your selues. And
what is this? The holy Oblation it selfe, whether Peter offer it
or Paule, or any Priest of what merite so euer he be: is the
selfe same, which Christ his owne selfe gaue to his Disciples, and
which the Priestes now also do consecrate. Nothing lesse
hath this, then that. Why so? Because they be not menne,
that consecrate this, but Christ, which consecrated that before.
For as the wordes which Christe spake, be the same that
Priest: now also doe pronounce: euen so the Oblation is
one, &c.

*4. thinges
to be con-
sidered
touching
the Sacri-
fice. 1.
The real
presence.*

In this saying of Chrysostome, foure thinges are to be
considered. First, that the Oblation which here signifyeth
the thing offered, is the Body and Bloud of Christe. For it
is that which is consecrated by the Priestes pronouncing the
same wordes that Christe did. But the wordes that Christe
spake, were these, this is my Body, this is my Bloud, as the E-
uangelistes declare, and we ought to thinke that he spake truth:
wherefore when the Priest duely pronounceth the same, which
he doth at the Masse, he maketh and consecratieth that which
Christe did, to witte, his Body and Bloud.

*2.
Christ of-
fered him
selfe at his
Supper.*

Secondly, that Christ made an Oblation of him selfe at his
Supper. For els how, when, and where, gaue he the holy O-
blation to his Disciples? This cannot be vnderstanded of any
spiritual Oblation, as of Prayers, thankesgeuing, praises, reioy-
sing

ling in our Lords death, lifting vp of heartes. &c. For such kind of Oblations Christ neuer gaue to his disciples externally either at his Supper, or at any other time: but rather it was their dutie to geue such Oblations vnto him.

Thirdly, that this Oblation is one, and of the same worthinesse, how diuerse so euer the merite of the Priestes be, that do consecrate: because it is consecrated with the words of Christ now, with which he consecrated before.

Fourthly, that the Priestes do offer this holy Oblation vnto God, which is the Body and Bloud of Christ, whereby that which we call the Masse is proued. which Oblation, and that Priestes haue authoritie to offer, M. Jewel denpeth, but that vnto God he denpeth, partly by this, and more at large hereafter, it shal appeare.

Thus thou seest Reader, the Doctours, to whom I remitted the studious and learned Readers of my booke, for witness of the Sacrifice, be not dumme. And because M. Jewel beareth the worlde in hande, we are destitute of good records and authorities for this point: beside those I named before, now I wil name diuerse moe of such trust and estimation, as no Learned man hath euer taken exception against them. Neether wil I onely namethem, but also shew the place, where expresse mention of this blessed Sacrifice of the Church, which is the Oblation of the Body and Bloud of Christ, is made.

To beginne with the authoritie of the Church, it is needelesse. For to whom is it vnknown that knoweth any thing, how often in the holy Canon, in sundry other deuoute prayers, and otherwhere the Church reporteth, that shee offereth vnto God the pure and vnspotted hoste of the Body and Bloud of Christ: But the Church which after Christ ought to be most regarded and heard,

3.
The Oblation of the Priest is the same that Christ offered at his supper

4.
Oblation of the body & bloud of Christ made vnto God.

A briefe rehearsal of such, who haue geue witness for the sacrifice of the Altar.

A Reioindre to

Mr. Jewell like regardeth.

Councils If Councils wil like him, the numbze of them is great, that for the Sacrifice haue given their sentence. The first Council Toletane, cap. 5. the eleuenth, cap. 14. the twelfth, cap. 5. The third Council of Braccara cap. 1. The third Council of Carthage, the Cosiel of Nice, cap. 14. of Antisiodorum, cap. 8. To these might be added two later Councils, that of Florence vnder Eugenius the. 4. in þ decree there made of the vnion of þ Armenians. And þ of Constantia, where wikeleses errour was condemned, who said it was not founded in the Gospel, that Christe ordained the Masse.

**Auncient
Bishopes
of Rome,**

As for the Bishhop of the See Apostolike, though Mr. Jewell, the Devil, and al heretikes that euer were, beare endlesse hatred to that See, and to them whome God hath appointed to be gouernours thereof; because they were learned, holy, and of grate antiquitie, that beare witnesse to the Sacrifice: I should do them and the Church iniurie, if in this cause I refused their recorde. Of them therfore some here wil I name, as who do profess the faith of the Apostles and the Church, to þ one. For the Sacrifice then, may be alleged S. Anacletus, de Consec. dist. 1. cap. Episcopus. S. Alexander the first de Consecra. distinct. 2. c. nihil. S. Eusebius, de consecrat. dist. 1. c. consulto. S. Iulius de Conf. dist. 2. c. cum omne crimen. S. Felix, de Consec. dist. 1. c. Sicut non alij. Soter in epist. ad episcopos Italiae. Syricius ad Cumeriu Tarracoensem episcopum, c. 1. Innocentius primus ad Exuperium Tolosanum episcopum, cap. 1. Leo ad Dioscorum, epistola. 81. All these be very auncient, and lined within the compass of the first six hundred yeares, when by Mr. Jewells owne opinion al was well.

**The other
Fathers
Greeke,
& Latines,**

Of the other old Fathers of the Church, if I would here allegg so many, as might be alleged for this purpose, I shoulde with

with much tediousnesse encombe the reader. I wil admonish him of a few, that be the chiefe. Of the Greke fathers, beside those which my answere to M. Jewel reciteth, this Sacrifice is atouched by S. Athanasius in lib. quæstionum ad Antiochū. q. 34. by S. Gregorie Nazianzen in Apologetico, & in carminibus. by Eusebius Emisenus, sermone 5. de pascha. by S. Chrysostome lib. 6. de Sacerdotio. By Theophylact, in cap. 10. epist. ad heb. By Damascen. lib. 4. de orthodoxa fide. cap. 14.

Of the Fathers of the Latine Church, for this doctrine we haue the plaine testimonies of S. Cyprian. lib. 2. eyist. 3. ad Cæcilium. Item Sermon de Cæna Domini. S. Ambros. lib. 1. Officiorum. cap. 48. S. Hierome. ad Hedibiam. quæst. 2. & aduersus Vigilantium. & ad Titum. cap. 1. S. Augustine. lib. 10. de ciuitate. cap. 20. & lib. 17. cap. 10. & lib. 20. Contra Faustum. cap. 18. Fulgentius. ad Monimum lib. 2.

The Latine
Fathers.

If M. Jewel not being habile with reason or learning to answer these holy fathers, vse his accustomed shift, and go about to auoid them with his common scoffes, saying they be but Quimmers, but Wisardes, but Dumme, and that al is but a Camisado, and I cannot tell what els: then I require the studious reader to resorte to the places here quoted: and assuredly he shall fynde them men of good vnderstanding speaking most evidently the truth concerning the vnblooddy Sacrifice of the Newe Testament, to haue faces, before which heretikes shal sone be confounded, armures & weapons, wherewith they shalbe vāquished and beate downe. Were to alledge there wordes, it werr to longe. wherefore let M. Jewel either denye these holy fathers, or scoffe out the mater no more with his terme of Quimmers, Wisardes, and Dumme. In dede perhaps his Serchers, waiters, and Promotours, may so handle our booke, as they shal neither be scene, nor heard to speake.

M. Jewels Replie.

Assure thy selfe good Christian Reader, there is no one thing more spoke of and witnessed by the holy Fathers and Councils, then the daily Sacrifice of the Church, then the unbloudy Sacrifice & oblation of the body & blood of Christ, then the host of the unspotted lambe, which Priestes of the new Testament after the order of Melchisedech do offer in the Masse. And that M. Jewel knoweth wel ynough. But now that he is ouer his haques he careth not, how farre he wade. Among whose other shifts this is not to be dissembled, that whereas I alleged the names of a great number of Fathers for witness of the Sacrifice: to such, as our whom some colour of disproofe might be cast, as to S. Clement, of whom he shootheth shoyre, and to Abdias, against whom he bringeth no pith, he saith much: to S. Dionysius, S. James, and S. Chrysostomes Liturgies, he saith a litle, and that is litle worth, as I haue declared. But to the testimonie of S. Iustinus, to the manifest place of S. Irenaeus, to S. Basile, & to sundry places that might be alleged out of S. Chrysostome, and to S. Cyrillus of Jerusalem, who most plainly treateth of that special matter: to all these he saith nothing, thinking it a more policie, forasmuch as their authoritie is vndoubted, and their wordes euident, and their faith inuincible: to passe them ouer with silence, then with an insufficient answer to discredit his cause, specially whereas he had shewed some face of an answer, in that he had saide so largely in disproofe of S. Clement, and Abdias.

M. Jew.
leaueth the
manifest
sayings
of certain
Fathers
vnan-
swere-
d.
Irenaeus
lib. 4. cap.
32.
in mysta-
gica cate-
che.
quinta.

Page. 5.

Yet in the margent of his booke, he wil send to answer by pretty briefe notes, calling sundry my allegations vntuthes. There in his. 6. vntuth, touchig S. Andrew, by him S. Andrew said the Communion, and not the Masse. An other where when the very terme of Masse is alleged, then must the Masse it selfe be a Communion. As where he bringeth in Abdias, saying cum Missam suscepisset omnis ecclesia. he englysheth it, *when the whole Church*

Church had receined the Communion, whereas the woordes Page 11.
Missa, in that place, signifieth not the Communion, nor the
Masse neither, but leaue to departe, which likewise of þe Brekes
is called ἀποστροφῆς, dimissio. So he enforceth both thinges and
wordes to serue his turne at his pleasure. And when he is dynen
to a narrow shift, the Masse it selfe, must be his Communion.

But I doubt not euery learned man wil laugh at this, that
S. Andrew should saye the new Communion. If he meane the
Communion that was frequented in S. Andrews time, which
was the participation of the Body & Bloud of Christ, and was a
thing that consisted in doing rather then in saying: as that I ad-
mitte to his final aduantage, so I requirer him also to admit the
Sacrifice, which then S. Andrew celebrated by saying and do-
ing, which I vnderstand to haue been the Masse of that time.
If he said not the Masse, as now it is saide, which I did not af-
firme: neither the Communion did he say, as the Sacramenta-
ries say it, yet the Masse concerning the substance of it, by re-
port of my allegation, S. Andrew both said, and to God offer-
red that holy Sacrifice and Oblation which I spake of.

In the 2. vnt ruth, There is no manner token or shew of priuate Page 5.
Masse, saich M. Jewel, whereas I alleged not S. Clement for
priuate Masse at al, but for Masse or for the Sacrifice. with like
vanitie in the other vnt ruthes vnt ruly noted, he answereth
chalke for these, as commonly they say, pretending contrary to
his knowledge, as after ward he cōfesseth him selfe, page. 12. lin. 29.
þ by those authorities I would establish specially priuate Masse,
wheras I brought them for witness of the Sacrifice onely, as
my wordes declare, whereunto for trial hereof I reporte me.
where in þ 10. vnt ruth, he auoideth þ grane authorities of S. Au-
stine, & S. Irenæus, in this note in þ margēt, a burthē of vnt ruthes:
who so euer wil cōsider þ places, he shal see M. Jewel further
burthēd

In my
Index
fol. 10.
& 11.

A Reioindre to

Lib. 4. c. 32 birthened with the weight of their sayings, specially of S. Irenaeus, then with al his light Rethozike and preuise Sophistrie, he is hable to discharge himselfe of.

The. 43.
vnttruth.
the Masse
set forth
by Cyri-
llus of Je-
rusalem is
not the ve-
ry order of
the Eng-
lish Com-
munion.

Among al other things, what meaneth he to note in his. 12. vnttruth, that the order of the Masse or Liturgie vsed in Ierusalem declared and set forth by S. Cyrillus Bysshop there, * is the very expresse order of the Communion. If by the woorde Communion he meane the Sacrifice of the Church, whercof we speake, as somtimes by the word Masse he meaneth the Communion: then that it is much agreeable in deede to the Masse, as now we celebrate it in the Church, I graunt. If he wil needes vnderstand the Communion, what Communion meaneth he? Is there any better Communion then their owne, which is the first, and of the newest making? If he meane that, verely he deceyvethe the worlde much, to say of that which S. Cyrillus declareth, that it is the expresse order of their Communion.

*In quinta
catechesi
mystagog.
Prayers
for the
deade fol-
lowed by
Cyrillus
of Ierusa-
lem.*

For there after the Sacrifice is offered, mention is made of the Patriarkes, Prophetes, Apostles, and Martyrs, that God through their prayers and petitions receiue our prayers. Then also there is prayer made for y^e Dead. And after the doctrine of S. Cyrillus, the soules of the departed haue great helpe, by the prayers made for them in that holy and dredful Sacrifice (for so he calleth it) that is laide vpon the aulter. But sith that in M. Jewels new Communion there is neither petition made for the prayers of the Saintes, nor prayers for the Soules departed: how is that which Cyrillus treateth of, the expresse order of their Communion? Truly in this vnttruth by M. Jewel imputed vnto me, he hath shewed him selfe not very true.

After that M. Jewel hath shewed his final reasons, for which he reponerth and condemneth certaine of the Fathers that I alleged for the Sacrifice, and not for private Masse: he commeth in

in with a numbre of questions vetered by whatifs. And saith;

Iewel.

What if neither Clement, nor Abdias, nor S. Iames, nor Basile, nor Chrysostome, nor any other in the answere to the Challenge alleged, speaks one word of priuate Masse? What if they haue not so much as the name of Masse? What if they testifie * against M. Hardinges Masse? What if they testifie fully and roundly vwith they holy Communion?

The 44.
but truth,
thei testi-
fie not so
much as
one worde
against
the masse.

Harding.

All this needed not, you bestow many wordes in vaine, for I thought them not in for priuate Masse, & that your selfe knew full wel, as by your owne wordes after, you confesse. what? lacked you better stuffe, that you followed a lye in so long a pro- cesse? why deny you that with so many wordes, which I confesse not? why proue you so at large and length that, which I denye not? That those Fathers speake not of priuate Masse, as though the Sacrifice were priuate, and that they haue not the name of Masse, I graunt. That they testifie against the Masse, I denye it. You say it, and say it againe, but you proue it not. When come you to the very point, M. Iewel?

Though they testifie with the Communion, what maketh that for your purpose? May not the Sacrifice of the Masse, and the Communion stand together? I meane not your new deu- sed Communion of the English Geneuians: but that of the ho- ly Fathers of the Primitive Church receiued and distributed. Therfore leane your common argument for shame, These Fathers testifie vwith the Communion, Ergo they testifie against the Masse, least men laugh at your simple Logike. For the argument is no bet- ter, then if a man should reason thus. M. Iewel breaketh his fast commonly with a couple of Egges, Ergo he drinketh no wyne at his dinner. which argument is foolish, for he may do both. Such is the reason you make for the affirmation

is in

of

A Reioindre to

of the Communion, to the denyal of the vnbloody Sacrifice, or the Sacrifice of the Masse: This is your common manner, by one truth to exclude an other.

M. Jew.
wels
Buts.

M. Jew.
bestoweth
many
wordes in
prouing
no man
denieth.

Now I geue M. Jewel leaue to runne his case freely without stoppe, from Butte to Butte, and to say his pleasure for one whole lease, that is to say, from the. 36. line of the. 10. page, which is his first Butte, to the. 29. line of the. 12. page, where he placeth his second Butte. There he bestoweth great paines, and almost runneth him selfe out of breath, to proue that which no man denyeth, that is, the Communion. And forthwith of euery Communion he inferreth a conclusiõ against priuate Masse, which by these Fathers no man went about to proue. And so he is compelled to say, when he commeth to his second Butte. For there thus he speaketh.

Iewel.

But he wil say, he alleged al these Doctours by way of digression, to an other purpose to proue the Sacrifice.

Harding.

Looke in my booke who list, for proufe of the Sacrifice he shal see these Doctours alleged. And knew you that M. Jewel? why then haue you triumphed so much at this whyle? Do you not thus saue to your selfe monsters, such as you may easily ouercome? At this whyle you haue fought with your owne shadow, and fiercely beaten the ayre. Thus some men with great courage let flee at their enemies absent, that dare not abide the skippe of a frogge present.

Of the authoritie of S. Hippolytus.

Iewel.

Teaching Hippolytus, the Bishop and Martyr, that, as M. Harding sayth, liued in Origen's time, and is now extant in Greeke, it is a

very

very litle booke, of smal price, and as smal credite, lately set abroad in print, about seuen yeares past.* before neuer acquainted in the world, &c.

It appeareth it was some simple man that wrote the booke, both for the Phrases of speache in the Greeke tongue, which commonly are very childish, and also for the truth and weight of the mater.

He * beginneth the First Sentence of his booke with Enim, which a very childe would scarcely doo. &c.

He saith and * soothly auoucheth, that Antichriste shal be the Denil, &c. And that he shal builde up againe * the temple of Ierusalem, That S. Iohn that wrote the Apocalips, shal come againe with Elias, and Enoch to reprove Antichriste. He allegeth the Apocalips of S. Iohn in steede of Daniel. Moreouer he saith that the soules of men were from the beginning, which is an Heresie. &c.

Concerning the place of him here alleaged, Venite Pontifices, (Come ye Bishops) &c. If he wil precisely builde vpon the wordes, then must al other Priests stande backe and haue no place in heauen, but Bishops onely. For although they offer vp, as M. Harding saith, the daily Sacrifice, yet it is well knownen, according to the nature and vse of the worde, they are Priests onely, and not Bishops.

Harding.

After this there followeth in M. Iewel a reponce of the anthonitie of the blessed Martyr S. Hippolytus, whose special words I alleged for witness of the Sacrifice, as I did S. Clements: Yet he saith, I brought them in as Summers, and dumme persons. That he was in Origenes time, wherof M. Iewel seemeth to doubt, S. Hierome affirmeth it. That his booke is litle, it is no argumēt of litle credite, as he would men to beleue. For the best Doctours of the Church haue writen bookes,

The 47.
vnteruth.
he was
wel knowen
before.

The 48.
vnteruth.
he beginneth
with other
wile.

The 47.
The 48.
vnteruth.
he saith
not so.

The 49.
vnteruth.
it followeth
not.

M. Iewel
secretly
light by
a uerborie
of the ble-
sed martyre
S. Hippo-
litus.
Hierony-
mus de
Script.
ecclesiast.

A Reioindre to

whereof some were of smal quantitie, yet of great authoritie and credit. The handling of that mater required no great booke. And S. Hippolytus besides this, wrote many other worthy bookes, which S. Hierome reckoneth.

Idem.

Hieronymus in Daniel. cap. 9.

That M. Jewel quareleth so with me for alleging S. Hippolytus, vnawares he falleth out with S. Hierome, for he allegeth him in his Commentaries vpon Daniel, and in an epistle to Lucinius, wherfore I looke that he deale the more gently with me for S. Hieromes sake.

If he were neuer before these last seuen yeares acquainted in the worlde, as M. Jewel saith; How came S. Hierome by knowledge of him and of his so many bookes, among whom this very booke of late printed is one? This may iustly be annumbred amongst other vntuthes of M. Jewels.

Neither saith S. Hippolytus, Antichriste shal build vp againe the Temple of Ierusalem, as M. Jewel reporteth him to say: but only that he shal build a Temple in Ierusalem of stone, as Christ shewed his flesh as a temple. There is an other vntuth reported of that holy Doctour. Certaine other I will let passe, as a thinge not worth the noting.

whereas he roterh his misalleging of the Apocalips for Daniel, his saying that S. John the Euangelist shal come with Enoch and Elias at the laste daye, and that Antichriste shalbe the Denil: al this he learned by the notes in the margent of the Catholike translatour Ioannes Picus. who warneth the reader to reade those thinges with iudgement, and yet doth not condemne the Autour therefore, as M. Jewel for better defence of his bad cause, by the libertie of his Gospel doth. who because he can pike some mores of smal errours out of the fathers eyes, thinkech it a sufficient reason to reiect them vterly, and to cloke the great beames of heynous errours in his owne eyes.

As

As touching our mater, that which I alleged out of S. Hippolytus, pertaineth to a known point of doctrine of the Church witnessed by him none otherwise, then the whole consent of auncient Fathers doth appoyne. But the thinges which M. Jewel hath picked out, were certaine particular pointes concerning the person, condition, and coming of Antichriste. wherein learned men have said their myndes, not so much definitely, as probably, and as they thought. And therefore S. Hippolytus, where he writeth that Antichriste shalbe a devil incarnate, a devil in the shape of man, (not simply the devil as M. Jewel reporteth him) he pronounceth his wordes so, as becometh a modest man, speaking of a thing not altogether out of doubt. Hanc (opinor) dilecti carnis sue substantiam phantasticam assumet organi vice. This phantastical substance (saith he) of his flesh a devil shal take (I thinke) verely beloved, in steede of an instrument to worke by. Here we see, how this holy Martyr uttereth that point touching Antichriste, as his private opinion only, not as a doctrine by consent of al determined, and generally to be beleued. Yet M. Jewel beareth the reader in hande that he saith it, and soothly avoucheth it, which is very untrue.

To say that the soules of men were from the beginning, if S. Hippolytus so said, in that time it was no heresie, though it be so now, because the Church, and consent of Christendome had not then defined it. For long after the time of S. Hippolytus, S. Augustin was doubtful touching the perfite knowledge of y^e soule, as it appeareth by that he wrote to S. Hierome, desiring to knowe his mynde in certaine obscure pointes concerning the soules of men. M. Jewel therefore sheweth his ignorance in charging S. Hippolytus with the crime of heresie therein. Orlesse his divinitie be such, as will make every opinion not defined by the Church to the contrary, to be an heresie.

M. Jew.
denieth
his owne
ignorance
Vide Tho.
p. 1. q. 112.
art. 3.
Augusti.
epist. 28. ad
Hierony-
mum.

Among

A Reioindre to

Among other things for which he goeth about to discredit the booke, he findeth fault with vnkil in the Greke tongue, in which the booke is written, and with childish phrases. As though *St. Iewell* could indge of the greke tongue so exactly, and were worthy to buckell the latchet of the shooe to that learned bishop and blessed Martyr, in emulation of whom, Origen that most eloquent and learned man, was stirred to write bookes vpon the scriptures, as *St. Hierome* witnesseth, what marvel is it, if this man scotte at me, and other catholikes, and finde fault with vs, seing that he spareth not such auncient fathers of famous learning, and alwaies so taken of the best learned?

St. Iewell
findeth
fault with
*St. Hippo-
lytus*
phrases.

Hierony.
*de scripto-
rib. Eccles-*
ia.

Yet let vs weigh the defectes, for which he maketh *St. Hippolytus* to be but a simple man.

Enim.

He beginneth (saith he) the first sentence of his booke, *vvith, enim,* which a very childe vould scarcely doe.

why say haue you no moze to say, then this? You spake of phrases of the Greke tongue, which you said were childish. And now haue you nothing to laye to his charge, but one poore worde, *enim*? I marvel that neither the Greke reader of *Oxford*, nor the schoolemaster there, with whom you conferred in making of your booke, nor any other of your felowes, whose conference was alwayes ready, would not, or could not haue better instructed you. At your owne smal sight in Greke I wonder not, but that the Greke reader should be so euil eyed or rather blinde, I marvel not a little. If *St. Hippolytus* had begon his booke in *dada*, with *Enim*, as you helpe him, or with *ya*, as by your wordes one may conceiue: you had some reason. For neuer was there booke nor sentence with either of these wordes begonne. But whereas *St. Hippolytus* beginneth with *Επειδὴ*, which in Latine signifieth not *Enim*, but *postquam*, *quum*, *quoniam*, *quandoquidem*, which manner of beginning is commendable,

dable, and before this time was never of any man repponed: he is cleared, and you M. Jewel founde very sawcy, so to controll the stile and phrase of that excellent father.

If γάρ be the word, that you spake saile with, which is added to garnish the phrase, and standeth not in the first place: γάρ,
for what,
and how
it is takē. your chferrers should haue remembred, that it doth not alwaies signifie, Enim. For sometime it serueth to an interrogation, as it is noted out of Eschines, οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ μὴν ἀνδρὶς ἥσυχος; as much to say, art thou able to bring so much as a village to rebell? Furthermoze many times γάρ doth abounde, is vacant and superfluous. For example, where Cicero saith in his booke de Senectute, Sed tamen, Gaza in that eloquent translation, where in he is reported much to haue folowed the elegancie of Plato, turneth it thus in Greke, ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁμοῦς. where γὰρ signifieth nothing, yet being superfluously put, bewitteth the phrase. And so may it seme to doo in the first sentence of S. Hippolytus Declaration, sometime it signifieth certē, quidem, verō, nempe.

Neither is it utterly strange or childish to beginne a booke with γάρ, when it signifieth enim, being put after an other worde as his nature requirerh. For so Aristotle, whom I trow, you accompt not for a childe, beganne his booke de Respiratione. περὶ γὰρ ἀναπνοῆς. &c. If you say, Aristotle might wel so begin, as hauing regarde of that went before: why may not the same be answered for S. Hippolytus? This much would haue ben learned M. Jewel of those that haue written obseruations of the greke tongue, before you had ben so rash, as to reppone so learned a father for his speech.

Thus whiles you geue your selfe wholly to reppone others, specially such as teach otherwise then you do: you shewe your selfe most repponeable.

A Reioindre to

And with as much witte and good diuinitie you answer the place by me alleged, as with modestie and aduise you reprobued the Doctor. Not being hable with truth to denye the plaine testimonie for the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe, you would faine shift your handes of it with an impertinent wra[n]gle. Because S. Hippolytus maketh Christe to speake to bishops at his iudgement, bidding them to come, who haue purely by day and by night offered vnto him Sacrifice, and haue daily Sacrificed his body and his bloud: thereof wil you conclude M. Jewel that priests must stand backe? I pray you what reason haue you therein: when wil you be ashamed of your solish negative conclusions? This is your ptenish argument.

Christe at the last day shal cal Bishops vnto his kingdome. Ergo he shal not cal priests, but they must stand backe, and haue no place in heauen.

A man may as wel argue and saye thus. Christe at the last day shal cal bishops vnto his kingdome: Ergo, he shal not cal laye men. Or, he shal byd men come, ergo, he shal not byd women come, but they must stand backe and haue no place in heauen. who euer heard moze chylidish reasons? Yet such be M. Jewels commonly, who so much scoffeth at other mennes reasons by his owne mery head falsified and set out of order.

But sy, why may not Christe I pray you at that day cal vnto him both bishops and priests: clerkes, and laie? men and women? If Christe shall saye; come ye bishops only, then I graunt priests must stand backe. But seing he shal say by report of my doctor, Come ye bishops, I besetch you be not so hard to priests, as to tel them, therby they are commaunded to stand backe, and so bereue them of that blessed expectation. . . . Because you wil seme to leaue no parte of S. Hippolytus wordes, which I brought for witnesse of the Sacrifice vntouched, let vs heare further

further what you say, and how you auoide that auctoritie so, as with reason you may be iudged to haue answered rhobiection.

Ievvel.

If he vvil make reckning of this vvorde quotidie, daily, then vvhere shal the bishop of Rome and his Cardinals staide, that scarcely haue leasur to sacrifice * once through the vvhole yere?

Harding.

what leasure the Bishop of Rome and the Cardinals haue, y^e pertaineth nothing to our presēt mater. Certain it is, you flatter them. For it is wel known that oftentimes in the yere they say Masse, wherein they offer the body and bloud of Christe vnto God. And that doth the Pope ouer the bodies of S. Peter & S. Paule now, as the bishops there did in old time, by report of S. Hierome. But what nede al these delayes? why trifle you thus, and kepe your self aloofe of, that you come not to the point? Leauē this wanton dallying M. Jewel in so serious a mater, and let vs heare your answer, if it be woorth the hearing.

Ievvel.

If it be Christe him selfe, that they offer vp vnto the Father, as they saye, how is the same Christe offered vp vnto Christe him selfe? How is Christe both the thing that is offered, and also the partie vnto vvhom it is offered? But there is no inconuenience to a man in his dreame.

Harding.

Marke reader, how this man procedeth with howes, and questions, after the guile of Jewes, Turkes, and Infidels, How is Christe offered vp vnto Christe (saith he,) How is Christe. &c. as before. what M. Jewel tu es magister in Israel, & hæc ignoras? Beare you the name of a bishop, and knowe not this point of Diuinitie? Finde you not this in Caluine, Peter Martyr, Cranmure, Bale, Hooper, nor in any other of your diuines of the new trade? A meete question truely for a Turke, and some-

The. 50.
but truth,
Sundry
cardinals
say Masse
most daies
in yere,
and this
present
Pope eue
ry day.

Aduersus
Vigilant.

Ioan. 3.
The igno
rance of
M. Jew.

A Reioindre to

what tolerable in an ignorant laie man, that would aske to learne, not to control. But one that in his booke calleth himselfe the Bishop of Sarisburie so many times (I trow that men should forgete the base name of M. Jewel) yea such a one as picketh forth before al his felowes, for feare least some other should proclaime the Challenge before him, and stand for the first game: such a famous Minister of the worde, to demaunde this question, if he were lawfully called to the charge of a Christian flocke, truly it were a mater to be lamented. O miserable flocke, that foloweth such a blinde guide.

*August. de
civit. lib.
10. cap. 20.
Christ as
he is one
God with
the father,
receiveth
Sacrifice.
And so he
is offered
vnto him
selfe.*

If this flesh Minister disdain to learne, or to be admonished at my handes, yet for thy good instruction Christian Reader vnderstand, that our Saniour Christe the true mediatour, in as much as he tooke the shape of a Seruaunt, as S. Augustine teacheth, he was made mediatour of God and men. And whereas in the forme of God he receiveth Sacrifice with the father, together with whom he is one God: yet in the forme of a seruaunt he had rather be a Sacrifice, then take Sacrifice. Hereby (saith S. Augustine) he is also a priest, him selfe the offerer, and him selfe the Oblation. Of which thing he would the daily Sacrifice of the Church to be a Sacrament, forasmuch as of the body it selfe, he is the head, and of the head she is the body, and as wel she by him, as he by her is accustomed to be offered. Thus S. Augustine. where expressly he saith, that Christe in the forme of God, and as he is God with the Father, so he receiveth Sacrifice. And so Christ in the forme of a seruaunt being the Oblation it selfe in the Masse, is offered to him selfe being in the forme of God.

*M. Jewel
maketh
for the
Arians.*

Beware M. Jewel, how you wade farre in denial of this point, and say that Christe is not offered vp vnto Christe, least you fall into the heresie of the Arians. For if you wil not haue Christe considered in the forme of a seruaunt to be offered vnto Christe

Christe in the forme of God, and as he is God with the Father: then make you Christe lesse then the Father, as the Arians did. May it please you to read what the learned bishop Fulgentius of Africa hath written touching this point lib. 2. ad Monimum, and if you wil beleue that aunient Father, herein you shal finde your selfe sufficiently resolved.

We not ashamed hardely to reuoke this foule errour, as likewise your ouer presumptuous malapertnes, in that you write y^e holy and blessed Martyr S. Hippolytus with dreameing. For the saying, which seemeth to you but a dreame, is his, not myne. Who by those words uttereth the same faith concerning the daily Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe offered by vnto Christe, which S. Augustine, Fulgentius, other Fathers, and the whole Catholike church teacheth. But what shal it auale me by writing to encountre him, who esteemeth the doctrine and faith of the church witnessed by such Fathers, for a dreame?

Ierrel.

And if it be the Masse that Hippolytus here speaketh of, how is it offered both day and night? For Hostiensis saith, it is not lawfull by the Canons to say Masse in the night season, sauing only the night of Christes Natiuitie.

Harding.

Yet more trifling delayses M. Jewell: when come you to the point? This is your rhetorike, with other impertinēt mater, and vaine toyes to fill the head of your reader, that therewith being occupied, he be withdrawen from due and earnest consideration of the point, that is specially to be answered. Such dilatorie pleas lawyers do sometimes deuise, least by present answer their bad cause should haue a foote.

But sye looke better in Hostiensis, and in other writers vpon the Canon Latue, to whome nowe you runne for aide, though at other times you make gaye spoyle of them:

and . . .

A Reioindre to

and I warrant you, neither by him nor any other, shal you finde it to be vnlawful for a priest, to celebrate the Masse sometimes an houre or two before daye. And so you might haue vnderstanded S. Hippolytus, if it had lyked you. Albeit I vige not so much the word λειτουργησαντες, wherevnto the mention of the day and night in the sentence of S. Hippolytus pertaineth, where by is signified that they did their seruice to God both daye and night: as that which there foloweth, pretiosum corpus & sanguinem meum immolastis quotidie, ye haue Sacrificed daily vnto me my pretious body and bloud, to which part of the sentence mention of the night doth not pertaine. And so your Lawyer Hostiensis maketh no note for you. Now at length after that you haue wearied your reader with much mater impertinent, what say you to the point? You see, S. Hippolytus speaketh in mosse plaine termes of the Sacrifice of the pretious body and bloud of Christe, daily offered by the bishops, which is that I went about to proue, what answer you vnto it?

Ieruel.

The. 51.
vnto truth.
It seemeth
not so.
The. 52.
vnto truth.
S. Peter
calleteth not
the people
by y^e names

But the meaning of Hippolytus* semeth to be this, that al faithfull people in this respect be priestes, and Bishops, like* as S. Peter also calleth them, and that euery of them by faith maketh vnto God a pure Sacrifice, and both day and night, as it were, reneweth, and applyeth vnto himselfe, that one and euerlasting Sacrifice of Christes pretious body once offered for al vpon the Crosse. Thus are the vvordes of Hippolytus plaine, and without cauil.

Harding.

Yea Sir: To whom I pray you semeth this to be the meaning of S. Hippolytus: To me it can not seme to be this, nor to any Catholike man I am sure, nor to any what so euer he be, that duly and indifferently weigheth the saying. Let the vvordes be wel printed in memorie. Christ shal say to the bishops at the la-

ter dait, pretiosum corpus ac Sanguinem meum immolastis quotidie, ye haue daily Sacrificed or offered in Sacrifice, my pretious body and blood. Semeth S. Hippolytus by these wordes to meane, that in this respecte al faithfull people be priestes and bishops? why, construe them M. Jewel. How can you make this seeming? O you say, in this respecte al faithfull people be priestes and bishops, and to them semeth Christ to speake by S. Hippolytus.

M. Jewel.
maketh
people
priests &
bishops.

Though the people were priestes and bishops as you say, yet in this place by report of this blessed Martyr, Christ is brought in thus speaking not to the people, for to them he speaketh afterward, but specially to bishops. For the order of the Doctor is an inuincible argument against you. First he maketh Christ to say, Venite Prophetæ. &c. Come ye Prophetes, then, come ye Patriarkes, nexte, come ye Apostles, after them, come ye Martyrs. Immediately in order he placeth the calling of bishops, and saith, Come ye Bishops. &c. After them he speaketh to the people in particular, Venite Sancti, come ye saintes that lyued hardly in hilles and dennes, &c. Come ye young wemen, come ye that loued the poore, and so to others. Lastly he saith to al in general, Come ye blessed of my father, &c. wherfore the name of Bishops here pertaineth to a special calling, not to al the faithfull people in general.

By the order of S. Hippolytus sayin-
ges, the name of bishops in this place pertaineth to a special calling.

And that he meant them which by special calling and consecration be bishops, and not the people, it is euident by S. Hippolytus him selfe, who is a litle before these wordes alleged, shewing that before the seate of Christ sitting in the last iudgement, they shalbe brought, who were once kinges, rulers, bishops, and priestes, (for these foure he nameth) he telleth wherfore, with these wordes, vt administrationis sue & ouilis reddat rationem, qui videlicet per negligentiam suam perdiderunt ouem de grege suo

A Reioindre to

his, to geue accompt of their gouernement, and of their folde, who through their negligence haue lost any Sheepe of their flocke. I trow M. Iewel you will not saye, that enery of the people, euery man and woman, poore and rich, young and olde, hath a folde of spiritual sheepe, and a flocke to kepe. Nay Sir, you knowe, the people be the sheepe them selues, they be not the pastours, the herdmen, the shepherdes: they be fed by their bishops and priests, they be not the feeders, they be lead, they be not the leaders, to be shorke in this respecte they be people, they be not priests and Bishops. Of such Bishops meant S. Hippolytus. Of which sort and vocation, because euery one of the people is not, therefore the meaning of S. Hippolytus semeth not to be that, which you haue imagined.

Againe what meane you M. Iewel by your respecte? Be all faithfull people, Priests and Bishops in this respect, that they offer vp vnto God the body and bloud of Christe? For to any other respect you can not drawe your wordes in this place. If you meane so, you must tel vs where you learned this strange doctrine. The faithfull people in dede do offer vp Christ to God, by vowe, and deuotion. But the body and bloud of Christ properly and truly can not be offered or Sacrificed without consecration, which pertaineth to the office of Priests only, and not to the people. And therefore this kinde of Sacrificing belongeth not to the people.

And whereas you allege S. Peter, saying that he calleth the people priests and bishops, that is a manifest vnruth.

1. Pet. 2. Though S. Peter call the beleuers a holy priesthod, meaning that euery faithfull person is a Priest, in as much as he offereth vp to God spiritual Sacrifices, as prayers, thanks geuing, praises, a contrite hart. &c. and specially in as much as he offered him selfe a lively hoste by mortification of him selfe: yet thereby he
- Rom. 12.

he meaneth not, that euery one may really and actually consecrate and offer the body and bloud of Christe. And how so euer the faithful people of S. Peter be called Priestes, yet verely, neither by him, nor by any other parte of Canonical scripture, or by any of the Fathers, be they called Bishops. Now our place of S. Hippolytus speaketh of Bishops, and not of Priestes. For his worde is not *ἐπίσκοπος*, but *ἐπαρχα*, whereby are signified the chiefe Priestes, or gouernours of Priestes, and by that name the people are no where called. Wherefore this exposition of S. Hippolytus meaning, deuised by M. Jewels new Diuinitie, is vaine, false, and sonde, and is founded vpon no grounde of scripture nor reason. For though a man apply to him selfe, as he speaketh, the Sacrifice of the pretious body and bloud of Christe neuer so much, yet is not that properly a Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe offered vp vnto God. The applying thereof of a man to him selfe, is not the Oblation, or Sacrificing of it. Thus S. Hippolytus standeth fully on our syde, and is not by M. Jewel answered, notwithstanding he hath said al that he could, vterly to deface his auctorytie,

The viij. Diuision.

Here M. Jewel starteth aside altogether, flatch him selfe in bye maters, and commeth not to the point. which is the policie of them, that haue not what to say directly, and yet are dynen to answer. For it semeth to them better in that case to vse sylfres, and say somewhat, though impertinent to the state of the present mater: then by yelding, or saying nothing, to seme ouercome. And because a mannes yelding to the truth, and acknowleging him selfe to be overcome, procedeth of humilitie, and humilitie standeth not with the spirite of heresy:

It is

thereof

A Reioindre to

theredof it commeth, that perfite heretikes seldom, or rather neuer gene ouer, and holde silence, though they be neuer so evidently confuted. Euen so it fareth here with M. Jewel. And so wilt thou iudge Reader, if with good aduise thou consider both our sayinges in this place. Maye if thou bring not with thee an attentive minde, he may happen to carrie thee awaye from the due consyderation of the mater, that is specially treated. Marke, and iudge.

There in effect I say this much. First, where as our aduersaries speaking of the priestes sole receiuing with great villanie of wordes, reppone private Masse, because the people do not participate of the blessed Sacrament with him: if they might be stirred to such deuotion, as to dispose the selues worthily to receiue their housel with the priest daily, as they did in the primitive Church: I aske, what these men should haue to say.

M. Jewel
starteth
from that
he ought
to answer
vnto, and
spendeth
many
wordes in
things
impertinent.

To this question M. Jewel, that maketh so long a Replye, answereth neuer a worde. But guilefully entrench into other matters impertinent, to lead the vnlerned reader from the question that is asked. Which impertinent matters, as they be easy to be answered, so for auoiding of tedious prolixitie, (whereof there should be no ende, if I would treat of euery thing that he bringeth without iust cause or prouise) I wil let passe, and leauing the confusion he goeth about to bring me vnto in answering, I wil rest in the point not yet by him answered. Therefore I demand of you once againe M. Jewel. whereas ye reppone the Masse, and caille so much at it, because the people receiueth not with the priest: If people were induced to receiue with him, what haue you then to say? As for example. we see in this Countrey, as also in other places we haue sene, certaine deuoute and wel disposed people, very oftentimes to receiue their housel with the priest at the ende of Masse, and that freely, and of their mere deuotion, and

and not by compulsion of law as ye do. what say you to such Masse? Like you it? Or do you condemne it? Answer in fewe, of or on. If you like it, raille and scoffe no moze at the Masse, but blame the people for their negligence, and lacke of deuotion. And if you wil blame the clergie for not warning the people of their duetie, I wil not therewith be offended, nor any good man els. Let negligence be reponed, and also duly punished.

If you like not the Masse, whereat many of the people doe receiue, as I thinke verely you would be loth to see it said & done again in sarisburie, as it was before you brought your new gospel thither, how many so euer receiued with the Priest: then tel vs for what other causes you accompt it vnlawful and contrary to the scriptures. And by gods grace we shal answere you, and withstand al your malice against the Masse, whether you fynde faulte with the priestes vestiments, with the gylted chalice, with the Latine tongue in which it is said, with the aulter, with y^e adoration of our Lozdes body, with lightes, or what els so euer it be, for which the deuil and you can not away with the Masse. If you tel vs this, then do you answere to the question which was demaunded of you, which yet you haue not done.

In case you could haue deuised a good and reasonable answer to this question, you should not haue had nede so farre to wander from the purpose, and to thrust into your booke such raffe raffe as you haue. when you were loth to disclose the weaknesse of your cause by making direct answer to my question, you thought good to leaue that vntouched, and to bring me into hatred with the readers, for saying, *the people be Dogges and Syvins.* The. 53.
 "wherein you repozte me falsly and vntruthfully. For read the vntruth.
 place who wil by your owne selfe quoted, and he shal fynde you I say it
 an vntreue repozter, and me cleere of that odious saying. For in not.
 that place is not so much as the name of Dogges.

It is

Likewise

A Reioindre to

*The. 54.
vntreue.
I say no
such thing*

Likewise without truth or reason, you would father this vanitie vpon me, as though I held opinion, that the negligence of the people must be the rule of Chyistes religion. And thereat, * as though I had said so in dede, you make gay sport: whereas no such thing can be gathered of ought that I said.

And though I said, the people in the primitive church receiued their housel euery day, that when so euer they should be taken and done to death by the Infidels, they might not depart hence without their viage prouision: foloweth it thereof M. Jewel, that I haue confessed there was no private Masse as you terme it in the primitive Church? If I had said expressely, that euery one had receiued the Sacrament with the Priest at church in the Masse time, and that the Masse was neuer celebrated, but when the people receiued: you might haue had some colour of your false saying noted in the margent of your booke, and of your vntreue collection in the texte of your Replie. Remember you not, that ech person most commonly serued him selfe of the Communion secretly at home, because they might not safely do it in solemne assemblie for their cruel Persecutions?

Now I pray you make your argument, and iudge how wise it is your selfe. Your aduersary saith, that the faithful people receiued the blessed Sacrament euery day by them selues secretly at home, hauing it consecrated at the handes of Priests: Ergo he confesseth there was no private Masse in the primitive church. I denye your argument M. Jewel, how prone you it? Both euery secret and private receiuing of one in his house by him selfe alone argue, that there was no private Masse? Why say, what if a man do now receiue at home, as sicke men do commonly, is there for that cause where this is done

done no private Masse: Merely Logike is good chepe, where such argumentes go for good.

I let passe many other thinges impertinent: As the bitter blame of the Clergie for that the people is no more preached vnto, and for taking vp their Tithes, for that the people vnderstandeth not al that the Priest saith at Masse, and because he vseth certaine gestures that M. Jewel liketh not. Item that the Pope and his Cardinals do scarcely communicate once in a yere, but are as negligent and vndeuous, as the people: al these and many other thinges wherewith he stuffeth his booke in this seneth diuision, I passe ouer, as not being worth the answering, and quite besyde the point presently treated.

One thing yet I thought good to note. what meant you to allege a Decree, whereby they were excommunicate in olde time, that being present at the reading of the scriptures, for negligence forebare to receiue the Communion: This was decreed say you by the fathers of the second Councel of Nicaea, and by your quotation you make it to be the. 84. chapter of canon, whereas of that Councel there be but ten in al, and among them that which you bring is none. This could I haue discerned, were not that your selfe in your Replie to M. Doctor Cole, make much a doo with the Reuerend father of blessed memory Stenen Gardiner, and triumphe at him as though he were a mā utterly vnlearned, for that in alleging a saying of S. Augustine out of his treatise de Sermonibus domini in monte, he named the third booke for the second.

The Canon which you allege is to be founde in the collection of Chapters, that bishop Martinus made out of the Brecke Councels, which as you allow to be of good auctoritie, so must you of reason allow the Masse also, whereof there is express mention by the name of Missarum solennia. Neither by
In collectione
 catione
 pitiu Gra-
 carum syn-
 nodorum.
 Can. 65.
 that

M. Jew.
 offendeth
 in that he
 blameth
 mothers.

A Reioindre to

that decree was any man excommunicate, that for negligence or wantonnesse withdrew him selfe from the Communion, as you do interpret the wordes: but for that he forbore to receiue the Sacrament pro luxuria sua, for cause of his lecherie, that is, because he had purposed to satiffie his vncleane luste, and rather then he would receiue with such a gilty mynde and intent, he would forbore and not receiue at al. For so the word Luxuria signified in that age, specially among the Ecclesiastical wyters, who were much gone from the exactnesse of the Latine speech vsed in the former ages.

The other cause of excommunication, (for two causes in this case be there expressed) was, for that as some one turned him selfe away from the Sacramēt, so would he also decline and go from the discipline, which was then ordeined to be kept in the reuerend Mysteries. These be the causes of excommunication in that Canon truly reported. So that of that Canon it can not be iustly gathered, as M. Jewel doth, that who so euer had for negligence refused to receiue the Communion with the Priest, had therefore ben excommunicate. The fathers were not so straight, but a man might escape excommunication, though at sometimes he were not disposed to receiue.

That I and my felowes, as you cal them, do flatter the people, and fauer their negligence in this case, it is a false slander. We neither flatter þ people forsloing their dutie, nor fauer their negligence, but wish with al our hartes, they would so liue and dispose them selues, as they might more often receiue that blessed Sacrament to their great benefite and increase of grace. And among other holisom lessons wherewith we taught them their duetie, before you and your felowes brake into our churches, and innaded the pulpites: we forgote not to put them in mynde thereof, and to exhort them therunto.

But

But that they should runne vnto it vnrerently, as to a drinking, or an other prophane busines, without al former and due preparation, not being before purged by confession, and reconciled by the Sacrament of penance, as we see they of your congregation do: from that wicked presumption, and contempt of the Body of Christe, by which we were redeemed: with al diligence we haue kept the people, and exhorted them to consider thorowly, to whose table they should go, whom they should receiue, and to how great benefite if worthily, to how terrible damnation, if vnworthily. So both we taught, and they beleued, that safer for them and better it were, to receiue that heavenly foode moze seldome and worthily, then often and vnworthily. Yet the oftener the better, if worthily.

In this Diuision, as M. Jewel answereth not the question demanded, but carrieth away the Reader to other impertinent mater: so neither saith he ought to my argument made in defence of the Priest, but bestoweth many wordes in thinges at this time not specially treated. The argument is this, as it may be easely conceived.

Where no fault is committed, there no blame is to be imputed. That often times the Priest at Masse hath no company to receiue with him, it proceedeth of the peoples vndeouion, not of enuie or malice, or any other default of his parte: Ergo for that there is no blame to be imputed vnto the Priest.

Here the Maior, or first proposition M. Jewel wil graunt, I am sure. As for the Minor, if he finde fault with the Priest, because the people by due preaching is not perswaded to communicate with him: then let him be blamed for his negligences therein, not for saying Masse. And though he were worthily blamed for that, yet is there nothing shewed why he should be blamed for celebrating Masse without the people receiuing the

A Reioindre to

the Communion with him . And so is the Priest cleared of all blame for saying Masse without a company to communicate with him.

¶ Now, I re-
conueigh-
eth him
selfe away
from the
purpose
by spea-
king thin-
ges imper-
tinent.

At this doth **¶** . He wel passe ouer without woide of answer ; vling silence for a vantage, where woordes shoulde betwray the weakenes of his cause . And forthwith he addresseth him selfe to talke of other maters, as of the preparation and disposition of the heart, befoze we presume to heare or receiue any thing that toucheth God . And that point he proueth by Pythagoras, and by the manner that Paganes vled in their Sacrifices .

**In the 2.
parte
Fol. 63.
a. & b.**

After that he hath bestowed many woordes vainely in that common place, which semeth to haue been taken out of his note booke : he goeth to say, what he hath found in al the Gospellers wrytinges alleged against Confession , which as to confute here were long, so very needelesse, forsomuch as I haue already proued the necessitie of Confession in my Confutatio of the Apologie.

This done he lieth fiercely at Priests , and layeth forth what he hath gathered together in his note booke out of S. Bernard against the euil lyfe of Priests , as though his fellowes were Angels , and he him selfe an Archangel . And here are brought in his golden cuppes , and treene Priests out of Bonifacius . which place is euer at hande , when he is disposed to weake his malice vpon Priests . Now I thinke it better to confute that he bringeth for proufe of his First Article against Masse whereat the Priest receiueth alone, (albeit in deede little it be, that he bringeth to that very point, and to the purpose directly) then to refel his unpertinent digressions , wherein he wandreth for lacke of good groundes to stay him selfe vpon. Thus I note, that he neither answereth the question, what these fellowes of his syde would say to the Masse, if the people would receiue with the Priest, nor saith ought to f argument, whereby

I p[ro]nt the Priest to be blamelesse in case of the peoples negligence. wherunto it was requisite he should haue said fully.

As for the Popes and Cardinals rare saying of Masse, preparation to be made when we heare any thing concerning God, Confession of sinnes, y^e Priestes saying of * many Masses in one daye, which is a manifest vnttruth, if he meane the ordinary custom of any day beside the day of Christs birth, the euil lye of Priestes, the causes of the peoples loosensse and negligence, the great multitude of Clerks in the Church of Rome: al these matters and many other bye things, that in this Diuision he telleth of, be quite beside the purpose. To al these idle pointes I intend to frame M. Jewel an answer hereafter, if I can not finde wayes how to bestow my time better.

The .xx.
vnttruth.
the priestes
say not
many masses
in one
day.

The Eight Diuision.

TO declare briefly the summe of this Diuision, for so much as the wordes which M. Jewel hath taken out of my booke, and here laid together, do import: First I aske with what face he and his fellows crye so busely for the Institution of Christe concerning this Sacrament, by whom in the chiefe pointes the same is violated. Therewithal I say, that in the Institution of the Sacrament thre things are contained which Christe him selfe did, and by his commaundement gaue the Church auctoritie, to do, Consecration, Oblation, and Participation, by which Participation I meane the receiuing of the thinges offered, in which thre consisteth the substance of the Masse. I say besides, that they hauing quite abrogated Consecration, and Oblation, haue lefte to the people nothing but a bare Communion. In consideration wherof, them selues

The summe
of this di-
uision.

A Reioindre to

being breakers of Christes Institution, shew to the worlde their shamelesnes, in that they require it so exactly of others.

Then omitting to speake of Consecration, and Oblation, of Participation I say this much. That as it is in it selfe necessarie and of Christes institution: so the number of participars together in one place is not of Institution. Thercof I conclude, that whether one or fewe, or but one in one place receiue: for that respect the ministracion of the Priest, in that we call the Masse, is not made vnlawful. This is the chiefe summe of that parte. The chiefe point that I stande vpon is this, that number of Participantes or receiuers together in one place, is Ceremonial, determinable by the Church, as many other Obseruances be, and not essential or of the substance of the Sacrament, or of the Institution of Christe.

Number
of recei-
uers toge-
ther is not
of the sub-
stance of
the Sacra-
ment, nor
of Christes
Institu-
tion.

Before M. Jewel commeth to this chiefe point, he wandereth farre abroade, and vpon light occasion taken of my wordes, maketh discourses against me. which discourses because therewith he impugneth the truth, & goeth about to subuert the Catholike faith, touching this weighty mater: little esteeming what he worketh against my person, for truthtes sake here I intend to discusse. Such credite I require the Reader to geue vnto him, as by his doctrine here he shal seme to deserue.

Iewel.

It liketh M. Harding to cal vs wicked, and the enemies, of the Sacrifice: and to say, vve iangle of the Institution of Christ, and yet our selues break Christes Institution.

Harding.

Fol. 12. a. b

Why M. Jewel doth your gilty conscience whisper you: in the eare, that I meant you, where I named the enemies of this holy Sacrifice: And take you peper in the nose, as thei say, because I meruailed, that they crye out so much for the Institution of Christ, by whom it is most wickedly broken: Loke in my booke

booke, and you shal see that I speake indefinitely. If you confesse your selfe guilty, and iudge it meant of you & your fellowes: you may yet repent, and amend that is amisse. Merely by ought you haue thereto answered, you haue not cleered your selfe.

That you are the ennemie of this blessed Sacrifice, euen here you confesse it for your selfe and for your fellowes: where you utter railing wordes of Satans prompting, calling that, against which you professe your hatred, errors, abuses, and sacriledge, maintained to the open derogation of the Sacrifice and Crosse of Christe. This is the utterance of your malice, wherein you powre forth the cankered humour of your stomake, & bewraye the weaknes of your cause. For God be thanked, your serpentine tongue hisseth more against the Sacrifice of the Masse, then your venomous tooth byteth with dent of reason. As here it shal wel appcare.

Id. Jew.
blaspheme
mouse railing.

Jewel.

As touching Christes institution, forget not good Christian Reader, that M. Harding confesseth, there are three things therein contemned, which as he saith, Christe him selfe did, and by his commaundemēt gaue auctoritie to his Church to do: the Consecration, the Oblation, and the Participation. Here he leaueh quite out the Annunciation of Christes Death, thinking perhaps it is no mater essential of Christes Institution. Of these three (he saith) we haue broken two, the Consecration, and Oblation: and so haue onely a bare Communion.

Harding.

I confesse these three things in dede to be obtained in Christes Institution, forget it not Christian Reader cisiones I require thee. But I leaue out the Annunciation of Christes death, saith M. Jewel. What then? I exclude it not, saie I. Be that of foure thinges nameth three expressely, excludeth not the fourth.

As touching Christes Institution, although I name expressely by Consecration, Oblation, and Participation: I except not

That
speaking
of Consecra

§ iii.

the

A Reioindre to

That,
speaking
of Consec-
ration,
oblation,
and parti-
cipation,
I exclude
not the
Annunci-
ation of
Christes
death.

*Eusebius
Emisen.
Hom. 5 de
Pascha.*

*Ambros.
in 1. Cor. 11*

Ibidem.

the Annunciation of Christes death. Yea I saye, that neither I leaue it out, as *St. Jewel* chargeth me, but how ignozantly he chargeth me, I learned *Diuius* do wel vnderstande. For these three do lineely shewe forth & preach vnto vs our Lorde death in facte, so that I worde of I Annunciation is needelesse to ech of them, though I word also be mentioned in the Masse. when we consecrate, when we offer, when we participate, or receiue I holy Oblation, what do we but signifie & shew forth the death of Christe?

Will you haue this much *St. Jewel* to be confirmed by the witnesse of some good Doctour of the Church? Heare you then first, what *Eusebius Emisenus* saith. *Quia corpus.* &c. Because (saith he) Christ would take his body from our sight, & bring it into heauen, it was necessarie that in the daye of his supper he consecrated vnto vs the Sacramēt of his Body and Bloud: that, that might be recorded stil by Mysterie, which was once offered for price. Next, what *St. Ambrose* saith touching this very thing, where he writeth vpon these wordes of *St. Paule*, *Mortem Domini annunciantes donec veniat*, Shewing forth the Death of our Lorde vntil he come. *Quia enim morte Domini liberati sumus*, huius rei memores, in edendo & potando, Carnem & Sanguinem, quæ pro nobis oblata sunt, significamus. For inasmuch as (saith he) we are deliuered by the Death of our Lorde, being mindeful of this thing, in eating & drinking (he meaneth at the holy table) wee doo signifie and shew forth the Flesh and Bloud which were offered for vs.

The same *St. Ambrose* saith againe there, He that cometh to receiue the Body of our Lorde, ought to iudge this with him selfe, that it is our Lorde, whose Bloud in Mysterie he drinketh, which Bloude is witnesse of the benefite of God. Which if we receiue with discipline, we shal not be vnworthy the

the Body and Bloude of our Lorde : for so we shal seeme to render thanks to our Redemer.

Lo M. Iewel if the Bloude in these Mysteries consecrated, offered, and receiued be a witness of Gods benefite towards vs, as S. Ambrose saith: then what do we by Consecration, Oblation, and Participation or receiuing, but testifie, recorde, and shew forth to al, the benefite of God, that is the death and passion of Christe, whom God gaue and deliuered for vs, that we thereby should be redeemed?

Neither that we after this holy Doctour, doing thus, onely testifie the benefite of God, which is the death of Christ: but also seeme thereby to render thanks to our Redemer. Now who so euer doth that, whereby thanks are rendred to his Redemer, the same thankfully signifieth and sheweth forth the Death of his Creator, by which he is redeemed.

That the Annunciation of Christes death is set forth in this Sacrifice, it is most clearly declared by S. James in his Masse or Liturgie, where he maketh the Priest that sacrificeth, the Deacons that attend vpon the Priest or Bishop, and the people that is present, to confesse the same.

First the Priest saith thus. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, &c. Do ye this in my remembrance. For as often times as ye eate this breade, and drinkethis Cup, ye do shew forth the death of the Sonne of man, and ye confesse his resurrection vntil he come. Then say the Deacons. Credimus, & confitemur. We beleue it, and confesse it. Then saith the people. Mortem tuam Domine annunciamus, & resurrectionem tuam confitemur. We shewe forth O Lorde thy death, and thy resurrection we confesse.

S. Chrysostome declareth fully and plainly, that as the

S. iiii

sacri-

A Reioindre to

Hom. 33. in sacrificing and eating of the lambe in the olde Lawe, was a me-
Mar. morial and recorde of the miracles, which God wrought in the
deliuerie of the people of Israel out of Egypte: so this Myserie
wherein the Body of Christ is sacrificed and eaten, is that, which
alwayes bringeth to remembrance and setteth before vs the
great benefites, that we enioy by Christs death and passion.

Hom. eadē writing vpon S. Mathew, among other thinges apper-
teining to the proufe of this point, he saith, that, because the
time should come, when Marcion, Valentinus, Manichæus, and
their folowers would denie that was donne by Christ in flesh (as
specially his true passion and death) Christe doth continually
bring vs vnto the remembrance of his passion by this Myserie:
that no man which is in his right witte can be seduced. There he
shuteth vp his whole tale with this Epiphonema, or conclusiō.
Ita per Sacratissimam istam mensam & saluat, & docet: hoc enim
caput bonorum omnium est. Thus through this most holy
table Christe both saueth and teacheth: for this is the head of al
good things.

Lo M. Jewel, heare you not that Christe doth the office
of a preacher & teacher at these holy Mysieries, which S. Chrys-
ostome signifieth by the name of this most holy table? which
sometime is called a table, because Christs Body and Bloude
are thence eaten and dronke, sometime an altier, because thereon
they are offered and sacrificed? And how doth Christe the office
of a teacher at this holy table, but by the ministerie of the priest,
who not by expresse wordes so much, as by worke and act it selfe
in the person of Christ, in the celebration of these Mysieries doth
preach, teach, signifie, shew forth, and bring vnto remembrance
the death of our Lorde: which shewing forth or Annunciation of
our Lordes death being the principal ende of Consecration, Ob-
lation, and Participation, and inseparably following the same,
as

as the ende foloweth the thing whose ende it is: **M. Jewel** sheweth him selfe an unskilful Divine, in that he chargerth and blameth me hauing rehearsed those threes, for leauing out the Annuntiation of our Lordes Death. For as he that saith, **M. Jewel** dranke a cuppe of wine, saith also that he swallowed it downe, though expressly he speake it not: So he that saith, Consecration, Oblation, and Participation be contained in the Institution of Christe: doth not (as he saith) quite leane out the Annuntiation or shewing forth of his death.

M. Jewel.
swangled
through
his owne
unskill.

The Scripture it selfe declareth this most evidently. For 1. Cor. 11. **S. Paule** describing to the Corinthians, how and what Christe did at his Supper, hath thus. Do ye this, so oftentimes as ye shal drinke for remembraunce of me. For as oftentimes as ye eate this breade, and drinke this cuppe: ye do shew forth our Lordes death, vntil he come. So I turne it after the Greeke text by the Present tense, which hath καὶ αὐτὸ ποιοῦτε, for so doth Nicolaus Gabasila, that learned Greeke vnderstand the place with other Greekes. Thus by **S. Paule** the eating and drinkeing, which I vnderstande by Participation, is an Annuntiation, and a shewing forth of Christes death, which **M. Jewel** very ignorantly pretendeth to be quite left out, wheras the doing of the other, is the most persite performance of this.

I sayd the ennemics of this Sacrifice haue broken the Institution of Christe, for that they haue abrogated the Consecration and Oblation, and haue left to the people but a bare Communion, and that after their owne manner. **M. Jewel** would seme herewith offended, & pretendeth that he and his fellowes haue both the Consecration and Oblation. But how wel he proueth it, let due examination trie.

Iewel.

Concerning Consecration, he doth great wrong to charge vs with the breach thereof, before he him selfe and others of his side be better resolued vnderstandeth Consecration.

The 46.
vntil truth.
we are per
sistly reioi
ced herein

A Reioindre to

Harding.

I do you no wrong in saying, that ye haue adrogated the Consecration and Oblation: for very true it is, as in further processe it shal plainly appeare by sufficient proufe and by your owne confession. But you do me and Christes Church greates wrong, by saying that I and they of my side, who be al that stand in the Catholike faith, be not wel resolved, wherewith standeth Consecration. For truth it is, we are perfectly resolved according to the instinct of the holy Ghost, and doctrine of al holy Fathers of the Church, that the Consecration of the Body of Christ consisteth in these wordes of our Lord by a Priest duly pronounced, Hoc est corpus meum, This is my Bodie. Likewise we are resolved concerning the Consecration of the Bloud. By imputing vnto vs the contrary, you proue your selfe a false slanderer. And here let your owne words be witnesse of your falsched.

The. 57.
vnto truth.
they say
it not.

Bonaen-
tura in. 4.
Sentent.
Bessarion
de sacra-
mento Eu-
charist.
The. 58.
vnto truth.
he writeth
not so:
but spea-
keth only
of a fewe
late schis-
matike
Greekes.

Iewel.

For Scotus and Innocentius tertius, and certayne others* say that this vworde, Benedixit, He blessed, vworketh Consecration. The common opinion is, that it is vrought by these vwordes, This is my Body. Some thinke that Christ spake these vwords twice, first secretly to himselfe and afterward openly, that the Apostles might vnderstand him. Cardinal Bessarion Byshop of Iusculum writeth thus. The Latine Church folowring Ambrose, Augustine, and Gregorie, thinketh that Consecration standeth in these vverdes, This is my Body. But the Greeke Church thinketh the Consecratio is not vrought by these vverdes, but by the prayer of the Priest, vvbich foloweth afterward, and that according to S. Iames, S. Chrysostome, and S. Basil. By these* it appeareth, that they them selfe of that syde, are not yet fully agreed vpon their owne Consecration.

Harding.

You make but a slender reason against the Catholike Church,

Church of Jewel. For what if Scotus, and Innocentius Tertius, (as for your certaine others, you woulde haue named them if you had them) and some Schismatickes of the late Breke Church, thinke Consecration to be done, by other then our Lords wordes, is not the Catholike Church therfore herein resolved? Shal the diuerse opinion of so fewe, preiudicate the vniiformitie and concord of the whole? Make your argument after your owne Logike, and the world shal easily see how peeuish it is.

Scotus, and Innocentius, and a fewe schismaticke Brekes thinke of Consecration otherwise then the Church holdeth: Ergo, the Church is not resolved by what wordes Consecration is made.

By such Logike it were easy to conclude against you many absurdities. But it is a very bad reason, you wil sticke to vse, rather then not to say somewhat against the Catholikes.

Now wherfore brought you in these fewe as Hummers? why speake they not for you? Discharge your credite, where teach they their doctrine contrary to that the Church holdeth? wil you haue men beleue your bare worde? Wercly then are they sure to be oftentimes deceived.

Neither Scotus, nor Innocentius Tertius euer sayd, as you repozte, that the worde Benedixit, He blessed, worketh Consecration, as though we should thinke that the Priest doth consecrate the blessed Sacrament, when in the holy Canon, and about the wordes of the true Consecration he pronounceth this worde, Benedixit. It semeth that you neuer read them, but folowed your note booke made out of some Gospellers treatise, or that you vnderstande them not, where they seeme to speake somewhat like to the you repozte of them, there they speake not specially of

The objection
out of
Scotus &
Innocentius answered.

M. Jewels Replie.

the forme of Consecration, which the Church vseth : but of that
 In 4. sen- whereby Christ at his Supper consecrated.

As for the wordes of Consecration of the Body, looke you in
 Scotus, and you shal finde him say, they be foure, which in order
 distinct. he reckeneth. the Pronounce Hoc, the Verbe est, & in apposito,
 8. quest. corpus meum, as he speaketh. The Coniunction enim, saith
 2. he, is not of the essence of the forme. Of the forme of Consecration of the Bloude, he treateth also very exactly, and learnedly remoueth doubtles that might rise thereof, of which some be objected to the Catholikes, by the Lutherans, and Zuinglians. wherfore of al men that euer wrote, you had lest cause

M. Jew.
is saide to
flee to
Scotus
for helpe.

M. Jewel to bring Scotus against the Catholikes for shewe of any brawle, cauil, or wrangling, to be made touching the doctrine of Consecration. But it is a signe you be neare driuen when you are faine to flee to Scotus for helpe, whom otherwise you little esteeme, because his doctrine in manner in al other pointes doth condemne you. But you care not what any be, so he seme to haue but halfe a worde against any thing that we saye, as in him yet you haue none.

Innocent.
De officio
Missa. lib.
3. cap. 12.

As for Innocentius, he doth not so determinatly pronounce sentence in this matter, as he declareth what certaine men haue said thereof. Whereas the Priest (saith he) at the pronouncing of these wordes, This is my Body, This is my Bloude, doth consecrate: it is iudged credible, that Christ also consecrated by speaking the same wordes. After this he rehearseth the opinion of certaine others. Of which some saide, that Christ consecrated, when he blessed, so construing the letter, as by blessing, they meant also the wordes, This is my Body, to be added. So benedixit, referred to Christe, significth this much, that Christe blessed with saying, This is my body.

Others haue saide (saith he) that Christe both consecrated the

the Sacrament, and instituted a forme of consecration after blessing, when he saide, This is my Body. These two opinions by him reuerfed, he sheweth his owne, and that with such modestie, because it was not commonly holden, as I wishe **My.** Jewel would vse the like, when he vpholdeth any newe and strange doctrine contrary to that, the Catholike Church hath euer taught. Sane dici potest, Soothly it may be saide, saith he. And there telleth what may be sayde, and doth not determinatly affirme, what is to be saide. Wherein he sayde his owne opinion, that appeared to him probable, he pronounced not a definitive sentence, wherevnto enery man should stande.

The modestie of Innocentius in ventering his opinion.

Now this much you should haue considered, before you had spoken so rashly against vs not being resolved for Consecration: This small diuersitie of Opinions is touching Christ, how and whereby he Consecrated, by that he blessed, as some fewe saide, or by his diuine power, as Innocentius thought, or by saying, This is my Body, which is the common and receiued opinion: but as touching the forme of Consecration, which Christ lefte to the Church, & which the Church vseth, & hath alwayes vsed, which is, This is my Body: therein al Catholikes be fully resolved. Yea although some susteyned a diuerse opinion from the rest, concerning that whereby Christ consecrated: yet they and al in general are resolved vpon this, that Priestes ought to Consecrate by pronouncing the wordes of our Lorde, This is my Body, and none other. So that this hath been agreed vpon by al, that the Church consecrateth the Body of Christ, with these wordes, This is my Body. Thus it is proued, both that I haue here done you no wrong, and that you haue bely-

The Catholikes be perswaded resolved with what wordes the Body and Bloude of Christ is consecrated of the priestes.

M. Jewels Replie.

ed vs, and haue shewed your selfe malapert in a mater, which you seme not to vnderstande.

In lib. 4.
sentent.
distinct. 8.

As for Bonauenture whom you allege, as you directe the Reader by your quotation, you haue sowlly abused and falsified him. For whereas he reiecteth the opinion of certaine, and confuting it, as writing vpon the fourth booke of Lombardus he is to be seene: it is no reason you shoulde take holde thereof, and laye it to our charge, as a thing maintained by the Catholikes. For that place it selfe: is a witness against you. Is it not a shame to allege that against the Catholikes, which they reprove and confute?

M. Jew.
allegeth &
objections
which the
Schoole-
men confu-
ted, as
doctrines
mainte-
ned by the
catholikes
M. Jew.
satisfieth
Bonauenture.

That Christe spake the wordes of Consecration, (some deceiued men said as Bonauenture there reciteth) *first secretly to him selfe*, (saith M. Jewel) *Primo in occulto ad conficiendum*, First in secrete to consecrate, saith Bonauenture repeating the erroneous opinion of others. And *afterward openly, that the Apostles might vnderstande him*, hath M. Jewel. *Secundo in aperto ad formam institutam manifestandam*, hath Bonauenture, that is to say, secondly (Christe spake) openly, to thintent the forme of Consecration instituted might be made manifest. What falschod is this to turne, *Ad formam institutam manifestandam*, that the Apostles might vnderstande him?

Is this the right englishing of Bonauentures wordes? Because you denye the forme of Consecration which the Church vseth, therefore you were loth any woorde shoulde be seene in your booke thereof, though the Doctor you allege, speake of it neuer so plaine. You had done better, if you had neuer alleged neyther Bonauenture, nor Scotus, nor Innocentius, nor S. Thomas, nor Beffarion, for al these make most euidently and expressly against you, as they shall finde

M. Jew.
allegeth
doctors &
make most
expressly &
directly

synde, who for tryal of the truth, wil take paynes to reade ^{against} ~~him.~~

But let vs come to Bessaron, who was not onely Bishop of Tusculum, as *M. Jewel* noteth, but also Patriarke of Constantinople. Out of him he allegeth a long sentence, but so as falsifiers are wont to doo, leauing out a parte by mangling, and mingling his owne wordes with the Doctors, so making of the whole, a mingle mangle. For whereas Bessaron speaking of the Latines saith, that they affirme most manifestly those wordes, This is my Body, and, This is my Bloude, to be the wordes whereby the Body and Bloude of Christ are consecrate: that good peece hath *M. Jewel* cut of, which maketh for the truth: and putteth in of his owne, the name of the *Greeke Church*, whereby the Reader myght thinke, the whole Church of Greece to vary from the Latine Church, touching Consecration: whereas Bessaron nameth not the *Greeke Church*, but certaine *Greekes*, and them specially of late yeares, for so be his very wordes, *Græci uero, præsertim recentiores, &c.*

Concerning the thing it selfe, what pson is that of disagreeing, and that the Catholike Church is not resolved by which wordes the Body of Christ is consecrate, because some *Greekes* of late yeares among other their errors, haue this also, that they thinke it to be Consecrate by the prayers of the Priest, which he made after that the wordes of our Lord, this is my bodie, be pronounced: If we may not say, þ church is resolved in any thing, which by Heretikes haue ben gainsaid: what thing is there in our religion so sure & certaine, wherein is may be said to be resolved: wherefore we leaue þ singular opinion of a fewe late deceined *Greekes*, to the Schismatick *Greekes*, to whom *M. Jewel* now seeth for helpe of his bad matter.

A Reioindre to

Take them vnto you M. Jewel if they like you : For where they forsake the Church, there also do we forsake them.

And so far as much as they are holden for Schismatikes, and be diuided from vs for sundry other pointes, but specially for their error touching the proceeding of the holy Ghost: you doo vs great wrong to burthen vs with their vnttrue opinion of the Consecration. which you do, where you say after the falsified sentence of Bellarion alleged, *By these it appeareth, that they themselves of that hyde, are not yet fully agreed vpon their owne Consecration.* Those deceiued and schismatike Greekes be not of our syde M. Jewel. They of our syde, that is to say, al men that hold and mainteine the Catholike faith of Christes Church, be, and euer haue been fully agreed and resolved vpon this point, that the Mysteries are consecrate by the wordes of our Saviour, This is my Body, This is my Bloud. And that of no man could you haue learned better the of Bellarion him selfe, whom you allege, who hath most exactly treated thereof in his booke De Sacramento Eucharistie written for the same purpose.

No man
declareth
the vniforme
consecration
of the church
touching
Consecration
better
then Bellarion.

There speaking of the late Greekes his countrie men, he saith, that as by the calamities of the times they haue lost many thinges that had their first beginning among them, (he meaneth the knowlege of thinges that belong to the Sacraments) so they haue also forgotten these rites. But where he speaketh of the olde learned Fathers of the Greeke Church, namely of S. Basil, S. Chrysostome, John Damascen, and others: he sheweth plainly, that touching Consecration, they were of the same minde and iudgement, as the Latine Fathers be. The reasons whatsoever haue been objected by Nicolaus Cabasila, Marcus Ephesinus; or any other late Greekes against the common consent of the learned Fathers of bothe Churches, there most learnedly and in good order he dissolueth, and in the conclusion persuadeth al

as wel Grekes as Latines, touching Consecration so to thinke and belene, as the holy Romaine church thinketh and beleneth. which is, that the body of Christe is consecrate by these wordes, of our Loyde, This is my body, and the bloud likewise by these, This is my bloud. That if you allow (M. Jewel) the auctoritie of that great learned man Bessarion, then you haue to belene, that both these be the wordes of Consecration, and so agreed vpon by the whole Church of God: and that by vertue of them duly pronounced by a priest in the person of Christe, the bread is turned into his body, and the wine into his bloud. which would God, that for the saluation of your owne soule, and of many other ignorant soules that be carped away vnto euerlasting damnation by your false doctrine and counterfeit shewes of learning, you would truly belene and professe.

Jewel.

How be it, by what so euer wordes Consecration is made, it standeth not in the abolishing of natures, as M. Harding* teacheth: nor in precise and close pronouncing of certaine appointed wordes: but in the conuerting of the natural Elementes into a godly vse: as we see in the water of Baptisme.

Harding.

It is agreed vpon by al, beside the enemies of the unblon- by Sacrifice, that the Church hath the wordes of our Loyde for the consecration, and that our Loydes body and bloud are consecrate by these his wordes, This is my body, This is my bloud, duly pronounced by a Priest. Neither standeth Consecration in the abolishing of natures, as M. Jewel vntuly reporteth me to teach, but where Consecration is duly done, there by the almighty power of the word, the bread is verely conuer- ted into the body of Christe, and the wine into his bloud. which conuer- sion is not an abolishing of natures, as it liketh him to terme it,

¶ i

(the

The. 191
vntuly.
I teach
not so.
The. 60.
vntuly.
The con-
secratio of
the Eucha-
rist is far
different
from the
consecra-
tion of wa-
ter in bap-
tisme.

A Reioindre to

See my
Confutati
on of the
Apologie
Fol. 96. a.

(the authours of their lying Apologie call it *going to nothing*) but a change of substance into substance, of the substance of bread and wine, into the most excellent substance of the body and blood of Christe.

But what meaneth he to fynde fault with the manner of pronouncing the wordes of Consecration? would he haue vs after almost sixtien hundred yeres vniforme obseruation, by sundry miracles and otherwise witnessed to haue pleased God, alter and change the wordes, least the precise vse of them, as being certaine and appointed, should seme superstitious? But we will geue eare vnto him, when he bringeth vs good prouise, why we should solow his newe deuises before the Institution of Iesus Christe the sonne of God. who at his last supper speaking these wordes, which the Church vseth for the forme of Consecration, consecrated his body and blood, and commaunded his disciples to do the same. which they did, and taught the Church so to do, and shalbe done vntil he come againe, what so euer M. Jewel, his felowes, and al the wicked disciples of Antichrist shal worke to the contrary.

As for the manner of pronouncing the wordes of Consecration, whether it be close, which M. Jewel liketh not, or open and lowde, as the Grekes sometimes vsed: it is not so essential, but a godly Christen man may beare good hart toward eithers, and with al reuerence allow it, to what Church so euer he come. The auncient Church both Greke and Latine, pronounced the wordes of Consecration openly for increase of Faith, the Latine Church of later time hath pronounced them closely for the more reuerence, and to conserue the Maiestie of so high Mysteries. Of later time I saye, and yet when this custome began, I know not. Certaine it is that for. viij. C. yeres past, it was growen to be a custome, as appeareth by report of that learned and noble

Empe.

Emperour Carolus Magus. whom for proufe thereof I al-
leged in my answer to M. Jewels. 16. Article. where in his Re-
plie without iust cause or reason, he triumpheth at me, as being
contrary to my selfe, and hath put these wordes in the Margent,
Printed in great text letters, that it might the more appeare,
M. Harding contrary to him selfe: if he had vnderstanded me to
speake as I did, of the Latine Church of later yeres, and not of
the time of S. Clement, S. Ambrose, or S. Leo, of which time he
would my wordes to be vnderstanded: he might haue spared
much labour, and had lesse disclosed his owne euil disposition.

But as M. Jewel vnterly denieth that Consecration, which
the best leaured & most auncient Fathers haue alwaies acknow-
ledged, whereby as Eusebius Emisenus with these wordes set-
teth it forth, the inuisible priest by his secret power turneth bread
and wine into the substance of his body and bloud, which is the
special Consecration: so he admitteth none other, but y^e whereby
natural Elementes be conuerted vnto a godly vse. And that no
mā should mistake him, as we see. (saith he) in the wyater of Baptisme.
What see you M. Jewel in the water of Baptisme? See you Co-
secration? where see you it? Is the water in which you Baptise
infantes, Consecrated or halowed in al England, by the prayers
of the Minister? Haue you not abandoned that Auncient obser-
uation, and sundry others belonging to the administration of
Baptisme, which were vsed in the Primitive Church?

Yet you will say perhaps, that in Baptisme common water
is turned to a holy vse, and therein you acknowledge a Consecra-
tion. Yea sye, but that is a Consecration after the general signifi-
cation of y^e word. But the Diuines of the primitive church, & of al
ages speaking of y^e mysteries, do acknowledge y^e body & bloud of
Christ to be consecrate by a special Consecration, which is far other-
wise to be defined, then here you teach: not whereby y^e elements be
conuerted to a holy vse, but wher ther is by a marvelous change of

In the re-
plie. p. 550

Euseb. E-
misenus in
serm. de
Corpore
Christi.

M. Jew.
new Con-
secration.

Special
Consecra-
tion.

A Reioindre to

substance into an other, the presence of a most holy and diuine thing made present, to witte, the body and bloud of *Christe*.

Cyprianus
In serm.
de cena
Domini.

Before those wordes be spoken (saith *S. Cyprian* meaning the wordes of Consecration) that was common meate conuenient only to nourrish the body, and gaue helpe to the corporal life. But after that it was said by our Lorde, Do ye this in remembrance of me, This is my flesh, and this is my bloud: as ofte as it is done with these wordes, and with this faith, this substantial bread and the cuppe consecrated with the solempne blessing, doth good to the life and saluation of the whole man, being both a medicine and a Sacrifice to heale infirmities, and to purge iniquities.

Thus *S. Cyprian* of this special Consecration. In which he speaketh not only of the conuersion or turning of a prophane thing vnto a holy vse, but also of the conuersion and change of the thing it selfe, so that of bread be made *Christes* body, of wyne his bloud: which he saith to do good to the life and health of a whole man, and to be a medicine and Sacrifice to heale our infirmities, and to cleanse our iniquities. which great benefite to do, is aboue the dignitie of bread and wine of them selfe, be they put to an vse neuer so holy.

General
or common
Consecra
tion.

And that this be not taken only for the general Consecration, which turneth elementes to an holy vse, and that *S. Cyprian* speaketh not Sacramentally, so as the bread and wine be taken only for the signes of the body and bloude of *Christe*: his wordes in the same treatise do clearly witnesse, where he saith thus. *Christe* euen to this day doth creat, sanctifie, and blesse this his most true and most holy body. which wordes can not be expounded of the common and general Consecration of prophane thinges to a godly vse, seing they report a making, and sanctification, to witte that of bread be made the body, of wine the bloud of *Christe*.

S. B.

S. Basile in his Liturgie of Masse setteth forth the effect of this Consecration with these wordes. Make me meete by the vertue of thy holy spirite, that being indued with the grace of priesthod, I may stand at this holy table, and consecrate thy holy and vndefiled body, and pretious blood. For thou art he vvich offrest and art offred, which receiuest and geuest, Christ our God. Basilus in Liturgia.

Here two things are to be considered. First, the greatnes of the thing that is consecrate, the body and blood of Christe, next, the grace of priesthod, as therto being necessary, whereas by the general consecration, none so great a thing can be done, neither to the exercise thereof is requisite the grace of priesthod, wherby S. Basil understandeth the degree of the visible Ministrie, whereunto Priestes be admitted by imposition of the handes of a bishop. For things may be conuerted and appointed to an holy vse by others then by Priestes only, as many things be by gifte and will of godly and deuoute lay persons. Hereof spake Arnobius that old wyter, Quid tam magnificū. See Psal. 139. What is so worthie a thing, as to consecrate the diuine Sacramēts. And what is so pernicious, as if he do consecrate, that hath taken no degree of Priesthod?

And whereas your common and general Consecration say. Jewell, by which things are conuerted to a holy vse, as with yon the water is in Baptisme, and yet the same is not so much as by any praier of your minister halowed or consecrate: S. Ambrose speaking of the blessed Sacramens of the aulter, sheweth vs of a special Consecration, done by special wordes of our Lord him selfe, not only by wordes of a mannes prayer, by which the Elementes of bread and wine be not only conuerted to a holy vse, but into a holy thing, into an other most diuine substance of the body and blood of Christe. Consecration then (saith he) with what wordes is it, and with whose sayinges? of our Lord Ie- By the special Consecration, things be not only conuerted to a holy vse, but also into a holy thing

A Reioindre to

Ambrosi. *de sacra-*
ment. lib.
4. c. 4. **fus.** For al the other things that be said, (he meaneth doubtles at the holy Sacrifice of the Church) be praise geuen to God, prayer is made for the people, for kinges, for the rest. When the place is come vnto, that the reuerend Sacrament be Consecrate, now the priest vseth not his owne sayings, but the sayings of Christ. Therefore it is the saying of Christe, that consecrateth this Sacrament. Thus **S. Ambrose.** where he meaneth these sayings of Christe, This is my body, this is my bloud.

Here is to be noted **M. Jewel.**, that where other things what so euer be separated, appointed, or conuerted to a holy vse, it is done either by wil and order only without prayers, as things are consecrate among them of your secte: or by prayers consisting of mennes wordes, as water, Bread, Oile, Salte, Vestimentes, Chalice, Altars, Churches, and certaine other things are Consecrate in the Catholike Church. But **S. Ambrose** speaketh of an other manner of Consecration, which is done by the sayings of our Lorde Iesus, and by these only sayings, This is my body, This is my bloud, whereby duly pronounced by a Priest, the bread is conuerted not vnto a holy vse only, but into a most holy and diuine thing, the very body of Christe, and likewise the wine into his bloud. And this is the special Consecration that I speake of, which **S. Ambrose** calleth the diuine Consecration, because of the diuine wordes whereof it consisteth, the diuine power, which therein worketh the diuine effect that thereby is wrought. which diuine worke **S. Hierome** expresseth with a most significant word conficere, saying of Priests Christi corpus Sacro ore conficiunt. with a holy mouth they do Consecrate or make the body of Christe.

Ambrosi.
De ijs qui
iniciantur
cap. 9.

If so be (saith **S. Ambrose** in an other place) humaine blessing or the blessing of a man could do so much, as to change nature, what say we of the diuine Consecration, where the wordes of our Lorde

Lorde the Sauour do worke? How say you M. Iewel, can you reasonably, and according to faith, draw this diuine and maruelous Consecration, wherby such a diuine worke, by gods special power is miraculously wrought, to the limites of your General Consecration, so as nothing of moze excellencie be done in this, then in that, and in other vulgar Consecrations?

Let vs heare S. Chrysostome. Euen now also (saith he) is that Christe here present, which dighted that table. He him selfe doth Consecrate this also. For it is not man, which maketh these giftes that be set forth, the body and bloud of Christe, but it is Christe who was crucified for vs. The words be pronouced by the mouth of the priest, and (the thinges set forth) be consecrated by the power of God and grace. This is my body saith he. With this worde the thinges laid forth be cōsecrated. And as that voice which said, *Gen. 1.* Grow ye, and be ye multiplied, and fil. ye the earth, was once vttered, but yet in al times feeleth the effect nature working to generation: euen so that voice was once spoken, but it geueth strength and performace to the sacrifice through al the tables of the church vntil this present day, and vntil the comming of our Lorde.

Thus S. Chrysostome. In Baptisme M. Iewel which you bying for example, you haue no such change of the water, though spirituallly maruelous thinges be in y^e holy Sacrament wrought: nor in any other thing by your conuertyng to an holy vse, or otherwise by prayer consecrated.

Of this special Consecration speaketh S. Augustine. We (saith he) in the forme of bread and wine which we see, do honour thinges inuisible, that is to say, flesh and bloud. Neither do we likewise take these formes, as we tooke them before Consecration, seing that we graunt faithfully, that before Consecration it is bread and wine, which nature hath formed, but after cōsecration the flesh and bloud of Christ, which blessing hath cōsecrated.

*Augustin.
in lib. sen-
tent. Pro-
peri.*

A Reioindre to

I trow *M.* Jewels general definition of Consecration will not wel be stretched to that special consecration which *S.* Augustine speaketh of here. Merely water after it serueth for Baptisme, is both named, and taken to be water still, neither is it honoured, as the inuisible thinges of the Eucharist are, neither is it changed into any thing that it was not before, nor any terme of transmutation, transelementation, conuersion or mutation is applied by any Doctor to the very water of Baptisme. Neither is there any such change made at al in any other thing, how so euer it be consecrated and conuerred to an holy vse, as according to the sayinges of these aunciēt fathers, is made in y^e bread and wine, set forth for the vnbloudy Sacrifice. For in this Sacrament of the Eucharist only, the mater it selfe is changed into an other more pretious substance. In other sacramentes the vse of the Elementes only is changed to an holier vse, the Elementes them selues remaining vchanged.

But it appeareth, that *M.* Jewel as good a clerke as he would seme to be, hath not yet founde in the fathers, that Consecration is not al of one manner, and that he hath not read what *S.* Augustine writeth thereof. whose wordes these be.

Consecra-
tion is not
of one mā-
ner.

Augustin.

De peccato

rum me-

ritu et re-

miss. ca. 26

Holy

bread.

Sanctification, (wherby he meaneth the conuerting of prophane thinges or natural elementes vnto an holy vse) which is al *M.* Jewels consecration, is not of one manner. For the catechumens (who were the learners of our faith not yet Christened.) I thinke them to be sanctified after their certaine manner by the signe of Christe, and praier of laying on of handes. And that which they take, although it be not the bodie of Christe, yet is it holy, and holier then the meates with which we are nourished. Because it is a sacrament. Yea the verie meates with which we are fed to susteine the necessitie of this life, *S.* Paule saith, they be halowed or sanctified by the word of God and praier, with which we pray
when

1. Tim. 4.

when we are about to take refection for our poore bodies.

Thus S. Augustine.

Hereby we understand M. Jewels doctrine concerning Consecration, defined by his general and confuse description, which only and none other he admitteth, to be contrary not only to the faith of the church witnessed by so many auncient fathers, but also to confounde the degrees and specialties of sanctification, which partly by S. Augustine are touched here, and may otherwise at large be declared.

Iewel.

Christe said not, Say ye this: or by these wordes goe and transubstantiate, or change natures: But thus he said. Do this in my remembrance.

Harding.

As though Christe commaunding his disciples to do that he had done, would not them also to speake the wordes of Consecration, which at his supper he spake, the same being comprised vnder the signification and precepte of doing, which being done, transubstantiation forthwith followeth. What Christe did, that he priestes bounde to do, who in this respect be the successors of the Apostles. Christe as the Euangelistes and S. Paul do declare, tooke bread, gaue thanks, blessed, brake, gaue to his disciples present, and said, take ye, eate ye, this is my body. &c. And so of the cuppe. Now if M. Jewels reason be admitted for good, who may not make this argument? Christ said not, take ye bread and wine, but do this in my remembrance: Ergo, to the administration of the blessed Sacrament, it is not necessary to haue bread and wine. And then why may not an apple, and a cuppe of bierre serue? Christe said not, when so euer ye celebrate my supper, goe and gete you a companie, at least three together, how smal so euer the parish be: Ergo, the priest or any other person may go and take it alone, If so, then why make you so much

Mat 26.

Luc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

what will follow, if what so euer Christ said not, it may be done.

A Reioindre to

a doo with the priest for receiuing without companie?

Christe said not, looke that ye haue a Communion song or said, when so euer ye kepe my supper: But thus he said, Do this in my remembrance. Christe said not, let the holy Communion be said by a Priest or Minister, let the bread and wine be consecrate by a Priest, les it be done in Hebrew, Greke, Latine, Vulgar, English, or in any tongue at al: But thus he said: Do this in my remembrance. Ergo, why may we not ech man and woman receiue when we list, besides and without any Communion, without Priest or Minister? what nedeth any consecration? what skilleth it what wordes or what language be vttered? To conclude, Christ said not to his Apostles at his supper, see that ye make Priests, by whom the celebration of my supper may hereafter be kept and continewd, and cause your posteritie to do after you, as now ye see done: Al this Christe said not: but thus he said, Do this in my remembrance. Ergo, there is no cause wherefore now we should do, as we do at al.

These argumentes M. Jewel, wel may they become your tinkers and capsters, your fiddlers and coblers, and such other the rascals of the people, whom you and your selowes following the example of Jeroboam, Herod and Antiochus, haue made your Ministers, and haue committed to them charge of soules, (but O miserable soules): verely such a famous Superintendēt, and such a ringleader of this new Gospel as you are, they become not. They shame your Logike vterly, be it neuer so loose, neither procure they great praise to your open Rhetorike, which it doth your hart good to see so much praised of the vulgar and vblearned sorte. Yet this is the forme of argument, wherewith you and your companions begile the simple people, with none more: Christe said that, ergo he said not this. Christe
and

and his Apostles did so and so: Ergo, not thus and thus. Ergo, neither must we do thus and thus. By which peevish but wicked argument, ye withdraw Chyssen people from a great parte of Chyistian Religion. In steede whereof ye set up your vnrreligion, which now is the canker, and within fewe yeeres, where God for plague letteth it ronne, shalbe the ruine and extirpation of all godlinesse and true religion.

Iewel.

This is yvel noted and opened by * S. Augustine. Put the vvordes of God (saith he) vnto the element, and it is made a sacrament. For vyhat power is there so great of the vyater (in Baptisme) that it toucheth the body and vvashesth the harte, sauing by the vvorking of the vvorde? Not because it is spoken, but because it is beleued: and this is the vvord of faith, vvwhich vve preach. The vvord of faith vvwhich vve preach * saith S. Augustine, not the vvord, vvwhich vve vvhisper in secrete, is the vvord of Consecration.

The 61.
vnto the
This is
not there
opened by
S. August.
Tractatu
in Ioan. 3.
The 62.
vnto the
S. August.
saith
not so.

Harding.

I am content here to dissemble and let passe with silence, your false Englishing of S. Augustines vvordes. I wil not stay at trifles. But sye I pray you, where you say, this is wel noted and opened by S. Augustine: which *this* meane you, or what vnderstand you by this word *this*? Remember you where of you spake? A līne or two before spake you not of the Consecration of the Eucharist? Said you not, that it standeth not in the abolishing of natures, nor in precise and close pronouncing of certaine appointed vvordes: but in conuertyng of the natural Elementes vnto a godly v̄le, as you see in Baptisme?

By Iewel.
conforms
deth the
special con
secration
of the Eu
charist, &
the cōmon
consecrati
on of wa
ter for bap
tisme toge
ther.

By

A Reioindre to

By so saying seme you not either to confound the consecration bled in baptisme and in the Eucharist together, or to make a Consecration where no wordes be spoken at all: And how frame you S. Augustines wordes to your purpose, that you haue here so at large alleged?

In this place S. Augustine speaketh not so much as one word of the Consecration of the body and bloud of Christ, wherof I spake in my Answer, but of faith and of the Sacrament of baptisme. And that vpon iust occasion ministred vnto him by the wordes of Christe, which he tooke in hand to expounde. Only you say, *this is vvel noted and opened by S. Augustine.* But how it is noted or opened to your purpose, who can see, sith that S. Augustine speaketh not of our mater, but of an other? Yet you adde for the song of your triumph, after the rehearsal of his wordes, as though they had serued you to good purpose, and proued your strange doctrine thus.

Idem. The word of faith, vvhich vve preach saith S. Augustine, not the vword
Idem. vvhich vve vvhisper in secrete, is the vword of Consecration.
Idem. Yea M. Jewel? where saith S. Augustine so? verely in this

place he saith it not, as you allege. Are you not ashamed to make so open a lye of S. Augustine? He speaketh of the wonderful vertue wrought in baptisme. From whence (saith he) is so great vertue of the water, as that it toucheth the body, and washeth the hart, nisi faciente verbo, but by the word that doth it? This great vertue wherby the hart in Baptisme is cleansed, when the water toucheth the body, is specially attributed to the word, not to the natural element. And yet in Baptisme both must concur.

Idem. Why said not Christe (saith S. Augustine) ye are cleane for cause of baptisme, wherewith ye are washed, but saith for cause of the word, which I haue spoken vnto you: but for that the word cleanseth also in the water? Take away the word, and what is the water,

water, but water? S. Augustines purpose is in that place to declare, that in baptisme the word, that is to say, the word beleued, or faith in the word of Christe, is that whereby we haue most benefite in baptisme. Of faith speaketh he there; of Consecration of this blessed Sacrament, he speaketh not.

And wil you vnderstand M. Jewel of what word he meaneth? he declareth it there him selfe saying. This is the worde of faith, which we preach, saith the Apostle. For if thou confesse with thy mouth, that our Lorde is Iesus, and beleue in thy harte, that God hath raised him from the dead: thou shalt be saued. Rom. 10.

The word of Faith here specified, is the general word of faith, which word containeth the whole Faith. And if this word come to the Element, that is, if any person of full and perfite discretion: (for of such one speaketh S. Augustine in that place) professing this faith, be Baptized in water, with the Inuocation of the blessed Trinitie: by this word, because it is beleued, and not because it is spoken, he receiueth both Baptisme, and the effect of Baptisme. And that is it S. Augustine means by his phrase, consecratur Baptismus, whereas he saith thus, verbo fidei sine dubio, vt mundare possit, consecratur & baptismus. By the word of faith without doubt is baptisme consecrated to this ende that it may cleanse. By this word then is baptisme after S. Augustines mynde, consecrated to this ende, that it may washe and cleanse the receiuer.

To what purpose M. Jewel hath brought in al this, it doth not wel appeare, onlesse it be to this end, that there be none other word whereby the body and bloud of Christe in the Eucharist are consecrated, but the general word of faith, that is to say, preaching of the gospel. That he seemeth to meane, where he denieth the Consecration to stand in precise words. So that where so euer there is bread and wine layd on a table, the word of faith

is

preached.

A Reioindre to

The Loz= preached, beleued, and the Elementes receined: by this doctrine,
des Sup= there is the Eucharist consecrated, and the Lozdes supper made
per of this and kept. Likewise as touching Baptisme, if the word of faith
new Gos= be preached, and one beleue it, and haue water cast vpon him,
pel. though the precise wordes as M. Jewel calleth them, be not at
Baptisme al pronounced, which are the wordes of the innocation of the
a ter M. Trinitie, spoken by the minister, I baptise thee in the name of the
Jewels father, and of the sone, and of the holy ghost: though these be left
doctrine. out, by this doctrine of M. Jewels, the partie is baptized & safe.

And least any man should thinke, this word of faith, whereof S. Augustine speaketh, were of necessity to be beleued on the behalfe of euery one that is Baptized, as though the effect of Baptisme, which is cleansing from sinne, were to be obtained by the faith of the receiuer, and not by vertue of the sacrament ministered in the faith of the Church: S. Augustine in that place auoucheth this effect to be achieved of infantes, who be not yet able neither to beleue this worde of faith wth hart, nor to confesse it with their mouth. His wordes be these. Hoc verbum fidei tantum valet in Ecclesia Dei, vt per ipsam credentem, offerentem, benedicientem, tingentem etiam tantillum mundet infantem, quamuis nondum valentem corde credere ad iustitiam, & ore confiteri ad salutem. This worde of faith is so much vailcable of so great force in the Church of God, that through the Church beleuing, offering, blessing, baptizing, it cleanseth euen so litle an Infant, though not yet being able with hart to beleue vnto righteousness, and with mouth confesse vnto saluation.

*Treatise
in 10. m.
vt supra.*

**precise
wordes.**

If M. Jewel meant not so, as I haue now declared, why should he scoffe so at the precise pronouncing of certaine appointed wordes, and allow only the conuerting of the natural Elementes vnto an holy vse? Haue not these holy Sacraments certaine precise (as I may so cal them,) and appointed wordes for their

their forme, as wel as certaine precise and appointed Elementes for their mater? Is it not to be thought that he agreeth with his brethren of Geneva? In the Communion of the English church at Geneva, the wordes of Consecration be omitted, least the people by rehearsal of the wordes should be moued to thinke, that there is alteration made in the bread and wine.

The communion of the English church in Geneva without the wordes of Consecration.

Printed in Geneva

But here me thinketh I smell, where about M. Jewel goeth. Yet if I should utter it, doubtlesse he would charge me bitterly with gheasses, as in his Reply he doth oftentimes, though without iust cause. Caffe out M. Jewel the vile poison that you haue receiued of Caluine and swallowed downe, touching this blessed Sacrament, which yet you and your felowes dare not utter plainely. why speake you so as it were vnder a cloude that, which your Euangelist John Caluine of Geneva speaketh so openly in his Institutions, where he treateth de cœna Domini: where he teacheth these wordes, This is my body, which is geuen for you, to be wordes of promise in way of preaching at Christs supper, being in dede wordes of performance in way of working. That this is your opinion, I may gather partly, by that you say here, partly by that I finde in the booke of your English homilies which are read in your congregations, wherunto you haue geuen your consent and aduise I doubt not. Of this new, vaine, phantastical, and heretical doctrine, I thinke needelesse to say ought here, & same being very sufficiently confuted already by D. Saüder in his first booke, of our lordes supper.

Caluins strange doctrine concerning the wordes of Consecration.

Iewel.

With what honest countenance then can M. Harding say, that we haue no Consecration?

Harding.

With what countenance I said before in my Answer, with the same I say here again, not & we haue no consecration: but that we haue not the Consecration. A consecration after your manner

I iij

ye

A Reioindreto

Ye haue, I graunt, such as your Communion is: Schismatical Communion, schismatical Consecration. what say you now to the honestie of my countenance?

Levvel.

We pronounce the same wordes of Consecration that Christ pronounced.

Harding.

It is not euery pronouncing of the same wordes, that maketh the Consecration. A gyle, a boye, a woman, any lay person, a Minister of your congregation that is no priest, as ye haue no auctoritie to make any priest by lawfull imposition of handes for that ye are no bishops, againe you or who so euer besides hath not the general intent to do that the Church doth in the consecration of the blessed Sacrament, but utterly a contrary intent: al these, pronounce they the wordes of Consecration neuer so much, do not, ne can not consecrate. As for you, when ye pronounce the wordes, ye do but as one that telleth a tale, or readeth a lesson, not directing them to the bread and wine, in the time of pronouncing. Certain other thinges be requisite besides to due consecration, which they of your sect obserue not.

Euery pronouncing of the wordes of consecration maketh not consecration.

Levvel.

We do the same that Christe bad vs do.

Harding.

would God ye did. Then would ye not do, as ye do. which because ye do not, nor wil not do, the more greuous shal be your condemnation. Christe commaunded his Institution to be kept, and that to be done, which he himselfe did. He at his supper ordeined priests to be Ministers of this high mysterie, as him selfe was a priest after the order of Melchisedech, and prince of al priests. Ye for the more parte are no priests, nor none would be, for ye denye the outward priesthood, and Sacrifice of the new Testament. Christ at his supper offered him selfe, ye offer him not,

not, but thinke no man able nor of auctoritie, so to doo .
 Christe tooke Breaðe, and blessed it. Ye take not the breað
 but let it lye on the Table. Christ directed his intention to the
 Breaðe, which he shewed by taking of it into his handes .
 Ye as ye take it not into your handes, so ye turne your whole
 minde and intention from that which Christe did, and which
 the Church doth .

Iewel.

We proclaime the death of the Lorde . We speake openly in a
 known tongue, and the people understandeth vs : we Consecrate for the
 Congregation, and not onely for our selfe : we haue the Element : we
 ioyne Gods worde vnto it : and so it is made a Sacrament. Yet saith
 M. Harding, we haue no Consecration.

Harding.

Four things be necessarily required to the due Consecra-
 tion . The mater, forme, minister, and intent . The neces-
 sarie mater is breað of wheate, for the one kinde . And wine
 mixt with water for the other kinde . which mixture of water
 ye refuse, contrary to the auctoritie of S. Cyprian, of S. Ju-
 stine the Martyr, and of the whole Catholike Church . And
 so ye reniue the olde buried Heresies of Fermentarij, and Arme-
 ni . The forme, is the wordes of our Lorde , This is my bo-
 die, This is my Bloude, duely pronounced ouer the breað and
 wine . The Minister ought to be a Priest, and none other,
 consecrated and ordered according to the rite and order of the
 Catholike Church . Lastly, the intent to do that thing which
 the Church doth is also necessarie . For if a man do it in moc-
 kery, or by way of dissimulation, or with a contrary purpose,
 or without mind and intent to do that Christe ordeined to be
 done, and the Church doth : the Sacramente is not consecrated
 at al . This intent and minde, you M. Jewell and your fel-
 lows

four
things
are neces-
sarily re-
quired to
Consecra-
tion.

A Reioindre to

In the
English
Comunis
they delier
that by re-
ceauing
bread and
wine, they
may be
made par-
takers of
body and
bloud of
our Lord.

lothes do lacke, and at the Communion that ye celebrate in your congregations, denye utterly to consecrate or receiue the very Body and Bloude of Chryste vnder the formes of Breade and wine : but make your petition, that receiuing the creatures of Breade and wine, ye may be partakers of Chrystes Body and Bloude, therein declaring your selues to be the professors of the Sacramentary heresie . For euen so be the wordes of your inuocation in your Communion booke . In which inuocatioⁿ ye pretend and say it to be according to the Instituti^on of y^e sonne of God, whereas in deede any such Instituti^on of the sonne of God was neuer hearde of , and throug^h all the Scriptures can not be founde, no^r is it by any auncient and allowed Docto^r of the Church mentioned, that by receiuing the creatures of bread and wine, we should be made partakers of the Body and bloud of Chryste .

Now M^r. Jewel vntil you prone vnto vs , that ye the Sacramentaries , who beare the swaye in England touching maters of Religion , admitte and vse these foure things necessarily required to the due Consecration of the blessed Sacrament : I wil say stil as befoze , that ye haue not the Consecratioⁿ , though ye make your proclamation (as you cal it) of our Lords death, neuer so loude: though ye speake at your new Co^mmunion neuer so plaine & fine english : though ye make a mocke Consecration for neuer so greate a congregation besides your selues : though ye haue Breade Gods plentie, and tankardes of wine of the largest sise : to conclude, though ye preach the word neuer so busily . For it is not such proclaiming, such speaking of y^e vulgar tongue, such a new found tope as ye vse, such bestowig of your bread and wine, such prating of the Scriptures, that maketh the right and due Consecration wherof I spake, and wherof the best learned Fathers of the auncient Church haue most plainly

plainely spoken, as of them some here before I rehearsed,

Iewel.

And vvhether as he *saith further, that vve haue no manner Oblation in our Communion, he should not him selfe speake manifest vntruth hauing taken vpon him, as he *saith, to reforme falsbed.

The. 61.
vntruth.
I say
not so.
The. 64.
vntruth.
neither
do I say.

Harding.

where say I, that ye haue no manner Oblation in your Communion? Looke vpon my wordes againe, reade them diligently, and if I say so, then your Replie standeth in force against me. If I say it not, what shal I then say, but all is false that you say? But what els should you say, being determined rather then to subscribe, to gainsay me, though you damne your soule for it, but that which is false? Therefore truth being farre remoued from you, on lyes you take holde, and set them forth al your booke ouer, yea almost in euery sentence, to serue your turne at least way for some shew. I say then in my Answer, as in your owne booke it is to be scene, that the enemies of this blessed Sacrifice, haue quite abrogated the Consecration and the Oblation. By which who seeth not, that I meane the vnbloudy Oblation of the Body and Bloude of Chryste, which the Church of God doth dayly frequent in the Masse? I saide not that ye haue no manner Oblation. As neyther that ye haue no Consecration, which falsely ye impute vnto me. Neyer doo I saye in al my booke by these expresse termes, that I take vpon mee to reforme falsbed. With which also, as with other shamelesse vntruthes, you burthen me here.

But let vs see whether you can proue that you haue the Oblation that I spake of, Or if you be not able to proue

A Reioindre to

proue that, as I am wel assured you be not : tel vs what manner of Oblation ye haue.

Ieruel.

Thi. 67.
truth.
they say
not so.

For he knoweth we offer vp vnto God in the holy Communion our selues, our soules, our bodies, and almes for the poore : prayes, and thanks gening vnto God the Father for our Redemption : and prayer from a contrite heart, which, as the olde Catholike Fathers * say, is the Sacrifice of the Nerue Testament.

Harding.

The Gos-
pellers ac-
knowledg
no other
Oblation,
then the
Iewes
had in the
olde lawe.

I denyed one thing, and you affirme an other. These be your Oblations you say, which you offer to God in your Communion. Be it so. As these be the thinges, which ye ought to offer to God in dede : so whether ye do it or no, ye doo them vnfruitfully, yea being in heresie, after the minde of S. Augustine, ye do them to your perdition. If ye offer none other Oblation then such as these be, what difference in offering is there betwene you & them of y^e Old testamēt? Al these y^e Iewes offered befoze the comming of Christe into fleshe, no lesse then ye. Againe al these Oblations be offered by Lay men, by women, byesely by al sortes and degrees of people. It is a peculiar Oblation, & a singular Sacrifice that I spake of, as you know wel ynough, and such as is to be offered not by enery one of the people, but by special Ministers thereto appointed and ordeined.

Heb. 7.

If because the priesthod of the Olde testamēt is translated, it be necessary there be a translation of the Lawe also, as S. Paul saith : Now that ye claime the benefite and right of the Iewe lawe, ye must acknowledge a new priesthod, and a new Sacrifice belonging to the same. where is your priesthod? which is your Sacrifice? These Sacrifices and Oblations, which here you reckon, be not peculiar to the new Lawe, but are common to al Lawes. For they that serued God in the lawe of Moyses, and in the lawe of Nature, offered the Oblations that

that you tel vs of unto God, as wel as you of any of your sect do. Onely they offered prayes and thanks geuing unto God for Redemptiō to be wrought, whereas now these are offered unto him for Redemptiō already wrought. Otherwise there is no difference.

wherefoze if ye haue not the Peculiar Oblation and Sacrifice of the newe Lawe, which is the vnbloody Oblation of the Body and Bloude of Chyiste, that he instituted at his last Supper: then ye pꝛoue your selues not to be of this Lawe. And therefore are ye to be turned ouer to Moyses lawe, or to the lawe of Nature, or some other what so euer: for of Chyistes lawe ye be not.

where you say of prayer from a contrite hearte, that it is the Sacrifice of the Newe testament: You see it is no moze the Sacrifice of the Newe testament, then of Moyses lawe, then of the lawe of Nature. For in al lawes and in al times some haue made their prayers to God from a contrite hearte. Speaking thus, you speake vnlearnedly, and saying that the Olde Catholike Fathers haue so said, if you meane of the peculiar Sacrifice which S. Irenaeus calleth the newe Oblation of the newe testament: you speake vnruly. You should haue done wel to haue named them, and to haue alleged their owne wordes for your credites sake, or wherin you had done better, to haue said lesse.

Irenaeus.
lib. 4. cap.
32.

To conclude, vs offer vp as much, as Chyiste commaunded vs to offer.

Harding.

what ye offer vp, you haue now declared at the vttermost, and I dare say moze then ye do in deede. But ye offer not that which Chyiste offered at his Supper, which he taught and commaunded his Apostles, and in them their successors Bishops

The. 64.
vnruly.
ye offer
not the
Bodye
Bloude of
Chyiste.

A Reioindre to

*De conse-
cra. dist. 2.
cap. scrip-
tura.*

*Irenaus
lib. 4. cap.
32.*

*Fulgentius
ad Moni-
mum lib.
2. q. 25.*

of the New testament to offer. who after that he had Con-
secrated his Body and Bloude with his owne wordes, and
had made his Oblation to his Father : said Doo ye this in
remembrance of me. To confirme this with good witness, s
scripture saith (as writeth S. Cyprian to Cecilins) s, so oft as we
offer vp the Chalice for remembrance of our Lorde & of his Passiō:
we do that, which is certeine our Lorde did. And after that
a litle. We be admonished and instructed of our Lorde, that
we offer vp our Lordes Chalice mixte with Wine, according
as our Lorde hath offered. The chalice or cuppel likewise (saith
S. Irenaus) he confessed to be his Bloud, and taught them
the new Oblation of the new Testament. Which the Church
receiuing at the Apostles handes, ouer the whole worlde offereth
vp to God. &c.

These be good and authentical witness, what Chriffe
him selfe offered vp at his Supper, and what he taught, admo-
nished, and commaunded his Apostles to offer, and what of
them the Church hath receined, and now offereth ouer the
whole worlde. This is the Body and Bloud of Chriff vnder
the formes of Bread and wine mixte with water, the daily and
perpetual Sacrifice of the Masse offered vp to the Father, to
the Sonne, and to the holy Ghost, as the auncient Father
Fulgentius saith. which because ye offer not, but haue
utterly abandoned, the same being thus commaunded, ye
offer not vp so much as Chriffe hath commaunded to be of-
fered.

Leuel.

In deede we offer not vp Chresses Body to be a Propitiatorie
Sacrifice for vs vnto his Father. For that Sacrifice is once wrought
for al vpon the Crosse, and there is none other Sacrifice left to bee
offered

offered for Sinne. *Aug. in psal. 33.*

Harding.

Ye offer not vp Christes Body at al. And therefore ye saye true, as he doth, who saith, he doth not good workes to merite by them, when he doth no good workes at al. But if ye were Priestes duely consecrated by a Bishop after the rite and order of the Catholike Church, and would offer vp the new Oblation of the new Testament according to the institution of Christe, and as the Church hath received of the Apostles: then shoulde ye offer vp the Body and Bloud of Christe in Sacrifice. For doing whereof ye are assured by the auctoritie of the Catholike Church, and by the doctrine of al the Fathers.

Christus (saith S. Augustine) de Cor- *Aug. in psal. 33.*
pore & sanguine suo instituit Sacrificium secundum ordinem *Concilio.*
Melchisedech. Christe hath ordeined a Sacrifice to be made of his Body and his Bloude after the order of Melchisedech. *one. 2.*

And in an other place. Now (saith he) the Christians doe celebrate the memorie of Christes Sacrifice that was done on the Crosse, by the holy Oblation and Participation of the Body and Bloude of Christe. For this it were not harde to allege a greate number of Testimonies out of the moste *Contra Faustum Manichaeum. lib. 20. cap. 12.*
ancient Fathers. Let this of S. Augustine onely suffice in a matter not doubtful.

If then ye would thus doe, as by commandement of Christe, by continual practise of the Church, by the doctrine of the holy Ghoste directed by the Fathers, being priestes duely ordered ye ought to doe: then might ye truly say, that ye offered vp a Sacrifice Propitiatorie. For how saye you good Sir, as concerning the thing it selfe which is offered, will you denye, that Christes Body is a Sacrifice propitiatorie? Saith not S. Iohn, Ipse est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris, *1. Ioh. 2.*

Y iij

He

A Reioindre to

He is the propitiation of our sinnes? Saith not *Documentus*,
Oecumeni- Caro Christi est propitiatorium nostrarum iniquitatum, The flesh
us in cap. 3 of Christe is the propitiation, or the thing that obtaineth forgiveness
ad Rom. nesse for our iniquities? Saith not Christ him selfe of his body,
Luc. 22. This is my body which is geuen for you? and of the Cuppe like-
 wise, which is shed for you? Dorth not the forme of Consecra-
 tion repute, that the Bloude of Christe is shed for remission of
Dionysius sinnes? what els meant *S. Dionys*, when he called it *Hosti-*
Ecclesiast. am salutarem, The healthful hoste, or the hoste that procureth sal-
bierarch. uation vnto vs? Euery Priest (saith *S. Baule*) is ordeined to
part. 3. c. 3. offer giftes and Sacrifices for sinnes. Thereof it foloweth, that
Heb. 5. either we haue no Priest, or that we haue Sacrifice propitiatory.
 For that Sacrifice which is offered for sinnes is propitiatory.
Cyprian. What els meant *S. Cyprian*, where he saith that It profitech to
de Cena the life & saluation of the whole man, and that it is *Holocaustum*
Domini. ad purgandas iniquitates, a Sacrifice to purge iniquities, and a
 medicine to heale infirmities?

Now though this which we celebrate and do in the Church
 be an image and sampler of that which Christ did on the Crosse,
 in respect of the meane whereby it is done: yet notwithstanding
 we offer vp now the same bloud, which Christe did shedde
 vpon the Crosse, nolesse then if it were presently shed. Where-
De Consec. vpon *S. Augustine* said, *Semel immolatus est in semetipso Chri-*
distinct. 2. stus, & tamen quotidie immolatur in Sacramento. Christ hath
cap. semel. once been Sacrificed in him selfe, and yet is he euery day Sacrifi-
 ced in the Sacrament.

And though this Sacrifice was once wrought for al vpon
 the Crosse, as you saie, which is true as concerning the out-
 ward shedding of Bloud: yet dorth the same before God conti-
 new. and because nothing to him is so acceptabable, and to man
 so healthful: to him of the Church it is offered dayly, and to man
 applyed

applied vnto remission of sinne, as though very now Christe were dying on the Crosse, and freshe bleeding. That there is none other Sacrifice left for sinne, as you say, we graunt. For this is not another, it is the same, which continueth in truth and substance of the thing offered, though diuerse for the manner of offering.

Iewel.

But^a saith M. Harding, we make no mention of any Sacrifice in al our Ministracion: Therefore we breake Christes Institution. This reason impeacheth Christ him selfe as wel as vs: For Christe him selfe in his whole Ministracion spake not one worde of any Sacrifice, no more then we doo. Therefore by M. Hardings Logike, Christ him selfe brake his owne Institution.

The. 67.
vnto truth.
I say not so.

Harding.

Who so ether conferreth my sayings M. Iewel and yours together, shal sone take you with an vnto truth. God be thanked that you can not bring a true conclusiō against me, deduced of true premisses, no not in the smallest trifles, that you charge me withal. By, where I pray you say I, that ye make no mention of any Sacrifice in al your Ministracion? This is like the other vnto truths you reported euen here before concerning the Consecration, and the Oblation. As I might answer the most parte of your booke, yea in manner al, by saying, al is false, wherein I should say truely: so I answer here, that which you say is false, therefore it is not to be regarded, what thereof you conclude. Of the Oblation wherby I meane the vnbloody Oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, ye make no mention in your Communion booke, I am sure. And that you knowe your selfe, how so euer you be disposed to gainsay me, say I neuer so truely. But where true water wanteth, and a great booke is intended, lyes must serue in stede of good stuffing.

Z. j

Iewel.

A Reioindre to

Iewel.

The 68.
vnt ruth.
It is not
Christes
ordnance,
it is your
owne de-
uile.

But what should moue this man thus scornefully to ieast at
the holy Ministration, and to cal^e Christes ordnance a bare Communion?

Harding.

The Sa-
cramenta-
ries Com-
munion is
a bare Co-
munion.

I assure you M. Iewel, you are foule deceiued. I iea-
sted not, but spake in so good earnest, as so weighty a mater
requireth. Reade my woordes againe, and tel the worlde
wherein I ieast. I called your Communion bare, conside-
ring the lacke of Consecration and Oblation. For wher-
as eating is the consumation of a Sacrifice, which soloweth
the outward Oblation of the Sacrifice, and Oblation is of
thinges consecrated: ye hauing neither Consecration, nor Ob-
lation, what haue ye more then a bare Communion? Yea
bare I say, not onely for lacke of these thinges rightly done,
but also, and that most chiefly, because by your wil and intent
and according to your Sacramentary doctrine, ye minister to
your congregations (our Lorde deliuer his people from your
damnable deceit) nothing but bare bzeade from the Dugn to
eate, and bare wine out of the pottle to drinke. I ieast not
M. Iewel at any holy Ministration, neither cal I Goddes
ordnance a bare Communion, God forbid I should be so void
of grace, as therein to followe you, who ieast at Gods holy
ordnauces and thinges, more then any the blasphemoust wri-
ter of our miserable dayes, that for our countrie of England,
you are most worthy to be named the Lucian of our time.
In deede your new toyces, that you cal your holy Ministration,
I utterly reppone, your Schismatical and wicked Communion
which is no Christian Communion, I detest. Loe I speake
plaine, say not that I ieast.

Iewel.

A litle before M. Harding said, in Christes Institution three things

are contained. Consecration, Oblation, Participation:

Harding.

Adde the Article The, to these thre, as I did, and I acknowledge it to be my saying, falsifie not my wordes. what inferre you?

Jewel.

Immediately after, as a man that had sodainly forgotten him selfe, he saith, The number of Communicantes together in one place, that they iangle so much of as a thing so necessary, is no parte of Christes Institution.

Harding.

I remembred wel what I said, the same I say here againe. How are you able to shewe, that I forgotte my selfe, which both you saye in the Text, and also note in the Margent?

Jewel.

It is no marvel though wee can so il agree with the olde Catholike Doctours, that* falleth out so sodainely with him selfe.

Harding.

Here is much a doo. I require your piousse. would God you would utter fewer wordes and more truth, more pith of reason, lesse railing and depiauing of him, whom you would faine confute, if you could. Nay Sir, because I agree so wel with the old Catholike Doctours, therfore you and your fellowes fall out with me. And that fall wel doth appeare in their mad fretting writings. But them God wote, little do I esteeme, as neither you very much. Neither would I vouchsafe to answer your lying Replie, were it not for the vntaunted Peoples sake, whom (good soules) it greenerh me so

Ch. 69.
vntaunted.
I fall not
out with
my selfe at
all.

¶ ii

dangerously

A Reioindre to

dangerously by you to be seduced . But how prone you that
I forgote my selfe ?

Iewel.

*For if Participation be not necessary, how is it a parte of Christes
Institution, If it be a parte of Christes Institution, how is it not necessary ?*

Harding.

When come you forth with prouise of my forgettig of my selfe?
We thinke you haue forgotē, what you toke vpon you to proue.
Participation is of Christes Institution, and therefore it is ne-
cessary . Thus I sayd, and thus I say againe . what con-
clude you ?

Iewel.

*He wouldaine conuey Christes Institution, and his Masse, bothe
under one coloure . But they are contraries, the one bevrayeth the o-
ther .*

Harding.

These be but wordes and proue nothing.

Iewel.

*As for the Priest he taketh no parte of the Sacrament with others
which is the nature and meaning of this worde Participation, but re-
ceiueth al alone.*

Harding.

Participa-
tion what
it signifi-
eth.

Let the nature and meaning of this worde Participation be,
if one take parte of a thing with others, as you say. Yet in dede if
there be a Participation, it is inough, that one take parte with
an other. And where two alone be patteners, there properly is
Participation, and they are called Participes, Partakers, as of
Cicero, Iuno was called Particeps cōnubij, Partaker of wed-
locke in respect of her husband Iupiter . Neither is it neces-
sarie that where there is a Participation, there be a Division of
the thing participated into partes . For there is a Participa-
tion

tion of counsel betwene two frendes, where the whole counsel is imparted in common vnto both, of the one to the other. The woꝛde Participation, hath his name in respect of parts, not alwayes of the thing participated, but of the participantes, who being diners, make partes. And truth it is, who so euer receiveth the blessed Sacrament, he receiveth not a parte of Christes Body, being the thing imparted in the Sacrament, but the whole Body. For now as it is impassible, so it is indivisible. Therefore it is not taken in parte, but wholly.

In deede though that body we do participate the Godhead of Iesus, as saith Damascen, which because it is imparted vnto vs according to such measure of grace, as it pleaseth him to geue: therefore it is of him called $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\lambda\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ participatio; and they that receive be participantes, because one thing is imparted vnto them, be they in one place together, or a sunder, it shalbe not: the Sacrament is participated, and so there is a Participation notwithstanding. As there may be a participation of counsel, or some other thing betwene diners being aparte and divided. And because the Sacrament is not received of one alone, but of many, the thing being the common benefite of al Christian people: therefore the receivinge of it is called a Participation, though the receivers be in sundry places.

Damascenus lib. 4. cap. 14.

Participation of one thing may be attributed to those that be not together in one place.

When Dauid said, Particeps ego sum omnium timentium te, I am partaker of al that feare the, He meant not that he was in one place with al those that feared God: yet betwene him and them there was a participation. We being many are one bread, one body, for al we do participate of one breade, saith S. Paule. Yet his meaning is not so unreasonable, that al believers participate together, to witte in one place. Lo I am here, sayth Christe in S. Paule, and the Children whiche God hath geuen me. Forasmuch as the children be partakers of flesh and blood,

Psal. 133.

Metixom. 149. 1. Cor. 10.

Heb. 2. 14. 1. 3.

A Reioindreito

he also him selfe likewise did participate of them, *μετέχευεν αὐτῶν*, is to say, was made of flesh and Bloud likewise as the children. He tooke parte of them, nor with them, so as it be referred to the Children, as the English Bible hath, but not so wel: For *αὐτῶν*, them, is not to be referred to *Παῖδες* Children, but to flesh and bloude there mentioned. Now where as S. Paule saith, Christe did participate of flesh and bloud, there must be graunted a Participation. For he tooke flesh and bloude in the pure wombe of the Virgine Marie, and there he was contained of the holy Ghoste, incarnate and borne out of her, and so was participant of flesh and bloude: yet I trow, none will be so blasphemous, as to acknowledge any other partaker thereof with our Saviour in the same place. So the Priest at Masse receiuing the blessed Sacrament, doth participate, and there is a Participation, though he receiue not with others in the same place. As Christe did participate of flesh and bloud with others, but not together in the same place. Thus M. Jewel by this word Participation, you proue nothing at al against me, much lesse that I forgotte my selfe.

Jewel.
This is a very simple argument, Certaine circumstances may be altered: Ergo the Priest may receiue alone.

Harding.

It is a simple shift for M. Jewel, when he is not able to answer mine argument, to deuise a weake reason of his owne head, and to scoffe at it, as though it were by me set forth. Seeing that you father so many peeuish argumentes vpon me M. Jewel, which I make not, nor no man of any meane wit would make: I thinke it good to frame you hereafter certaine argumentes, which I will acknowledge to be mine owne, & demand your answer to them, or require you to subscribe, Whitherto you

You haue sought occasion to wander abroad in matters either altogether impertinent, or of lesse weight. Now by very order of my Answer to your Challenge, you are brought neare to the point, wherein the pith of the first Article consisteth.

Your large talke of Common and Private, your simple disproufe of the auncient Fathers, whom I brought in for witness of the Sacrifice, your feble answers to certaine auctorities by me alleged, your scoffing at the sequel of the Peoples negligence, your false slaundering of the Pope and Cardinals, your vnnecessary comen place of Preparation, & prouf of your general Consecration & Oblation, the handling of these and the like idle matters, hath thus farre serued you for stuffing of your booke. In folowing the course of your talke in these superfluous digressions, you haue kept your selfe, your Reader, and me your Consutour, aloofe from the chiefe purpose.

But now that we draw so nigh to the marke that you ought to shoote at, let vs so ioigne in discussion of the chiefe point of this Article, that as S. Augustine saith, mater with mater, cause with cause, reason with reason may buckle together.

Concerning the first Article of M. Iewels Challenge, which is of priuate Masse, as they of Luthers schoole terme it, two thinges are specially to be considered. whether the vnbloody & Mystical Sacrifice of Church, which comonly we call Masse, may be done without a number of communicantes with the Priest in same place, which after their selfe maketh it priuat, or whether any such was done with vs. C. yeres after Christs being on earth. The first is *Quaestio iuris*, & second is *Quaestio facti*. If the first be proued, it forceth not greatly, whether the second may be proued or no. For if a thig be lawful, the it might haue ben done, and it may be done. And for our case that is inough.

I iiii whether

Matters
impertinent
partly cou-
ched.
wherein
M. Jew.
hath to no
purpose
spent time
hitherto.

The mark
that M.
Jewel
ought to
shoote at.
*De vtili-
tate cre-
dendi ad
Honorat.
cap. 1.*

A Reioindre to

whether it haue been done, the p[ro]mise thereof for the most part is not so easy, because it dependeth of circumstances of time, place, and person, which seldom by euident witness of w[ri]ters be recorde[d].

In my Answer to M. Jewels Challenge I haue brought p[ro]oues for the one and for the other. The same hath he endeououred in his long Replie to refel. But how sufficiently, I leaue it to the skilful Readers iudgement. By comparison of my p[ro]oues & of his refutation together, it may best appeare, on whether side the truth resteth. which p[ro]oues how much he faileth of refelling, so much right he leaueth vnto me to chalenge him of his promise, and to require him to yelde to the truth; and

Fol. 12. b. to subscribe.

Et.

Number
of Com-
municantes
with the
Priest in
one place
is not ne-
cessarie.

In that parte of my booke which he hath laid forth in his s. Diuision, I affirme, that a number of communicantes together with the Priest in one place, is not of necessitie required to the right vse of the blessed Sacrament. which if it be true, then it foloweth by good reason, as there I saie, that although there be not others at al times ready and disposed to receiue the Communion with the Priest in the same place, yet for that respecte, the ministracion of the Priest is not made vnlawful. That thing then remoued for which of these men Priuate Masse is condemned, it standeth in force as before, notwithstanding his Replie, that he hath made notable with multitude of Vntruthes, rather then commendable for weight of mater. That al ambiguitie be auoided, and that by plainenesse the truth may appeare, Let mine argument, which in my Answer I made, thus be fourmed.

An argu-
ment pro-
ving pri-
uate masse
to be law-
ful.

It is neither of Christs commaundement, nor of the substance of the Sacrament or Sacrifice, that there be a number of communicantes receiuing together with the Priest

in

in the same place at the celebration thereof: Ergo the priest may without spume or offence, receiue by him selfe alone at the celebration. If a priest may so lawfully do, then is private Masse proued.

This is my argument, not that which M. Jewel maketh for me. Hereto he answereth thus.

Iewel.

Christe him selfe hath already determined the case. For al be it Christe haue appointed no certaine number of communicantes, yet hath he by special wordes appointed a number.

Replie
page. 10.
paragr. 1.

Harding.

I denye, that Christe hath by special wordes appointed a number of communicantes to receiue with the priest in the same place. Come to the point M. Jewel.

Iewel.

For these very wordes, Take ye, eate ye, drinke ye al, Diuide ye among your selues, do ye this in my remembrance, ye shal set forth the Lordes death: these very wordes I say, can not be taken of one singular man, but necessarily importe a number.

Mat. 26.
Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11.

Harding.

Christe speaking to his twelue Apostles, knewe that he spake to moe then one, and therefore he disposed his speech accordingly, and spake in the plural number, Take ye, eate ye, &c. But that a number should alwaies receiue with the priestes of necessitie, when they celebrate the Oblation: that is not imposed by the wordes. Neither at his whole supper uttered he any special wordes to that purpose.

For if vpon this place you ground a necessitie of number alwaies to receiue with the priestes at one time and one place, because Christ spake in the plural number, then likewise we may require you of no lesse necessitie, to haue a number of priestes or

A Reioindre to

Ministers as ye call them, to distribute the Sacrament to any companie of Communicantes that are to receiue, at one time and place, or els to haue no Communion at al. And furthermore by this conclusion, no one bishop of the world shal haue auctoritie to make Priests or gene holy orders, onlesse there be a number of bishops at one time & place together to do the same, because of Chyistes worde, hoc facite, do ye this. Of which thinges the two later to be absurde, the practise of your owne congregations do evidently declare.

Mark. 16. If because Chyiste speaking to twelue, said in the plural number take ye, eate ye, when so euer the Communion is receiued, it must of necessitie be receiued of a number together: then by like Argument, because Chyiste said to his Apostles, go ye, and teach ye al nations, baptizing them in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy ghoste: no man being neuer so diuinely called, may go and preach to any one alone, but must holde his peace vntil a number be gathered together, to heare the preaching.

Act. 8. Also by this argument the Minister may not Baptise, except there be a number together ready to be baptized. By this Argument St. Iewel condemneth S. Philip, who both preached to the Eunuche alone, and baptized him alone without other company.

John. 20. When Christ said to his Apostles, Receiue ye the holy ghost, whoso euer sinnes ye remitte, they are remitted vnto them. &c. Did he limite vnto the power of the keyes, so as they might not exercise the same, remitte, or retaine, onlesse there were a number together both of Priests to remitte or retaine sinnes, and a number of penitentes, whose sinnes were to be remitted or retained? which if it be true, then neither one Priest alone can exercise his auctoritie, nor any one penitent, can receiue absolution alone.

When

Aburdities following of St. Jewels fond kind of arguing.

When he said, forgive ye, and ye shall be forgiven, would he put vs in despaire of forgiveness, except there be a number of vs together, that would be forgiven? Luc. 6.

When he said, Vigilate, & orate, watch ye, and pray ye: ment he that we should neuer watch nor praye, but when there were a companie of vs together? Mark. 14

When he said, If they persecute you in this citie, flye into another: was it his meaning that no man should saue him selfe by flight in time of persecution, except he had a number of fellows to flye with him? Mat. 10.

When he said, Come ye al to me, that trauaile and be laden: forbad he any to come vnto him alone, whose harte he moueth, except he gete inde to come with him, or rather al to come with him, because it was said, Come ye al? The like absurdities might be alleged against your peenysly prouise of number in receiuing the Communion together. Jewels out of innumerable places. Wherefore you were best to geue ouer your arguing to proue this mater, and returne to your accustomed reprouing of vs the Catholikes, and disprouing of our prouises, wherein you spende your time and learning, though with final honestie, and litle gaine of estimation among the discrete and learned iudges. The farther you wade in this your argument, the more shal you fynde your selfe grabeled, and worse embroyled. Yet it seemeth you geue not ouer. You make a smooother before your flight out of the felde. For in your twelfth Division you say touching this mater.

He moueth talke of place, wherof we had no question. But the number of Communicantes, wherof S. Paule so plainly speaketh, he thought best to salue with silence. Page. 33.
Paragr. 3

Talke of place and of number receiuing the sacrament together,

A Reioindre to

ther, is coincident. For when a number receiveth together, they receive in one place. If not in one place, then neither together, onlesse you referre the terme *together*, to time, and not to place, which I trow you do not. For that should make litle with you.

The lacke
of number
of Commu-
nicantes
ought not
to stay the
celebratio
of the vn-
bloudy sa-
crifice.

But say, the number of Communicantes I saue not with silence. For I know it not to be soze, that it nede the saue of any leach. I meane, it maketh no woonde, nor so much as a raze in the countenance of the Catholike doctrine. For as we wish hartely that the whole number of Christen people would dispose them selues worthily, and be partakers of our Lordes body with vs at the Masse, to our vnspeakable comfort, and their inestimable benefite: and do oftentimes both in Sermons openly, and in Confession secretly exhort them thereto: So if for lacke of deuotion, or for any other cause they do it not: we knowe it to be our dutie in this case, to celebrate the memorie of Christes bloudy Sacrifice in the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Church, receiuing that which is offered, without other number of communicantes without any our default: rather then contrary to his commaundement to suffer his death in such manner as he him selfe hath ordeined, not to be set forth for remembrance.

Ieruel.

Yet saith M. Harding, S. Augustines wordes be plaine, *Saluator non precepit. &c.* Christe gaue no commaundement, in vvhich order it should be receiued: to the intent he might leaue that mater to his Apostles, by vvhome he vould dispose his church. Therefore saith M. Harding, the number of communicantes is at libertie, and the priest may receiue alone. S. Augustine in that place speaketh not one vvorde of any number, but on-ly of the time of receiuing. &c.

Harding.

I would be loth to hier you *M. Ieruel* to tel my tale for me in any weigthy mater, sith that you report my wordes so vn-truly

truly in a mater that should be handled with al truth and sinceritie. The manner of learned men is, to set forth the argumentes of the aduersaries to the most aduantage, and to hide nothing, wherein any force against the parte which they defende, may appeare. Your manner is quite contrary. You mangle my wordes, you disorder my sentence, you leaue out the synowes and iointes of my reason, and bying as it were only bare skynne and loose bones. If of it selfe it be good and probable, by your falsifying, and contrary framing, you labour to make it appeare weake, childish, ridiculous, and altogether besyde the purpose. And as you play this false parte in misreporting my sayings, so you deale much worse with fond argumentes, which you rather bypon me. But to neuer a good argument do you answer as becommeth a learned man, as nothing els do you prone by any substantial discourse in your whole great booke, but with scornful scoffes, bitter tauntes, and borrowed phrases, do only disproue. I require the reader who is loth to be deceiued, at al times to haue recourse to my sayings, and with good diligence to examine, whether they be iustly impugned by M. Jewell or no.

As touching the celebration of the blessed Sacrament, to the intent I speake of it clerely and without ambiguitie: some thinges be of precept, some of example only. It is of precept, that it be consecrated, offered, and receiued. Of example only that it be done after other meates, in the euen, with number together, with sitting at the table, &c. The thinges that be of precept, be of the substance, and al such be invariable. The thinges that be of example only and not of precept, be of order: and they are to be disposed by the Church, as S. Augustine saith in his Epistle to Iannarius. Our Saviour hath not commaunded in what order the sacrament from that time forward should be receiued, to the intent he might leaue to the Apostles that mater, by whom he

ag. Yet.
manner in
reporting
his aduer=
saries say=
ings and
argumentes
quite con=
trary to
the manner
of learned
men.

Touching
the blessed
sacrament
some thinges
be of Pre=
cept, some
thinges of
example
only.

Augusti.
epist. 112.

A Reioindre to

Order.
Time.

would dispose his Church. In which place although S. Augustine speake not of number expressly, but of the time: yet in that he speaketh of order in general, he meaneth al such thinges, as be not of the substance. If he had meant to haue spoken in that place of the time of receiuing onely, as M. Jewel saith: then would he not haue said, *Christe gawe no commaundement in vyhat order it should be receiued, but rather in vyhat time it should be receiued.* For Order is a general terme, pertaining to al that is not of the substance, as time, number, place, sitting, standing, &c. Time is special.

August.
ibidem.

Now that a number of communicantes alwaies receiue together with the Priest, it is not commaunded either by Christe, or by the Apostles, or vniuersally so vsed in the whole Church. Therefore when a number wanteth, the Priest may lawfully offer, (whereof S. Augustine speaketh specially in that place) and receiue alone. wherewith these men, specially M. Jewel, ought to be offended the lesse, leaning to S. Augustines auctoritie as he doth: forasmuch as in that very place he saith, *quod per totū orbem frequentat ecclesia, hoc quin ita faciendum sit disputare, insolentissimæ insanix est.* To dispute whether that as the Church commonly vseth to do thorow the whole worlde, be likewise to be done or no, is a point of a most proud madnes. By which rule M. Jewel seemeth to S. Augustine to be distract with most insolent madnes, as he that neuer ceaseth barking against the blessed Sacrifice of the Church, as it is generally vsed and frequented through the whole Church, where so euer God is rightly honored in the worlde.

As for Christes commaundement, I may say that concerning number, which S. Augustine in that Epistle to Iuanuarius saith concerning time. *Si hoc ille monuisset, vt post cibos alios semper sumeretur, credo quod cum morem nemo variaisset.* If Christ had com-

commaunded that the Sacrament should be receiued euer after other meates, I beleue no man would haue changed that manner. So if Chyriste had commaunded that it should alwayes be receiued with a number of other Communicantes at the same time and place: I beleue no man would haue ben so hardy, as to change that order.

Touching the number of communicantes, wherof S. Paule speaketh so plainly, as you saye: I assure the discrete Reader that shal peruse your wytynges and myne, that by S. Paule he shal finde you able to proue no better that of necessitie manye ought to Communicate together, then now you haue proued it by the wordes of Chyriste spoken to the Apostles then present, in the plural number. Albeit I know M. Jewel, what you haue alleged already in your chalenging Sermon, and otherwheres to proue that point. But verely in alleging those wordes, inuicem expectate, waite ye one for an other, you misse the marke, and shew your selfe either to mainteine that errour stubboynly, or to be deceiued ignozantly by geuing credite to your false schoolemaisters, Peter Martyr, Ihon Caluine, Thomas Cranmar, and such others of that syde, whom you solowe blindly and affectionatly, not hauing weighed the text it self, nor the auncient Fathers wytyng vpon that place. 1. Cor. 11.
In comment. ar. in
1. Cor.
cap. 11.

So; rightly to vnderstand the Apostle there, you must not misseconstrue him, as finding fault with the Corinthians for the forme and order of the administration of the Communion vsed among them, (for he findeth no fault therewith specially) but with the abuse of their publike Churchfeastes, which of the Fathers are oftentimes mentioned, and of some called *ἀγάπαι*. If you consyder the place wel, you shal not thinke your selfe furnished with any Argument at al out of that Epistle, for proufe

A Reioindre to

of the necessitie of your number receiuing the Communion together. Your errour of the necessitie of number you may not salue with an other errour. Yet let vs heare what you haue to say.

Iewel.

Page. 11. line. 1. That S. Augustine requireth a number of Communicantes, it appeareth by that immediatly in the same place he allegeth the wordes of S. Pauls, *Quapropter cum conuenitis ad manducandum, inuicem expectate.* wherefore brethren when ye come together to eate (the Communion) waite one for an other. Vybich wordes M. Harding thought best cunningly to dissemble.

I. Cor. 11.

Harding.

No, no M. Jewel, I haue not with any great cunning dissembled those wordes. You haue with more falsched then cunning added to the Scripture, by putting in of your owne with a parenthesis these two wordes (the Communion) to the intent that where S. Pauls wordes make not for you, your owne wordes being put to his, might supply that you would faine proue. If this sleight may be borne withal to serue your courne, you wil sone proue what you list.

If I had thought, those wordes of S. Paule had vndoubtedly made for proufe of your number of Communicantes together with the priest, and then had dissembled them: I had not done so cunningly, as falsly and wickedly. But because you better them for confirmation of your necessitie of number, thereby you shewe your selfe to handle your mater more boldly, then cunningly. For in dede those wordes of S. Paule serue nothing to your purpose. For trial whereof I referre me both to the exact construing of that texte it selfe, and to the auncient fathers who haue expounded the same, namely Eucherius, de difficultioribus questionibus veteris & noui testamenti. Theophylacte, the wy-

ter

ter of the tripartite historie lib. 9. cap. 38. Sedulius, S. Ambrose the author of the brieft Commentaries vpon S. Pauls Epistles set forth vnder the name of S. Hierome, and chiefly of al others S. Chrysostome.

The scope and purpose of S. Paule in that place, is not specially to deliuer to the Corinthians a doctrine concerning the celebration of the Sacrament, for that had he performed before, But now his special intent was to correct the great disorder that was commonly vsed amdg the in their Churchfeastes, by putting them in minde of the supper, which our Lord kept the night that he was betrayed. For what cause (saith S. Chrysostome) doth he make mention of the mysteries in this place? Because (he answereth) this talke was most necessary in the present case. wherby he sheweth that this mention of the Sacrament is brought in by S. Paule as a bye mater, yet to a very good purpose. His meaning is, that this mention is made, because the Apostle thought good to allege the example of Chyistes charitie and humilitie for amendment of the pride, contempt, and disdain, that was vsed among the Corinthians, who at their Church feastes diuided the selues from the companie of the poore, & taried not for them, but went to their meates alone, and despised them, and so shewed great abuse, not in the order of ministring or receiuing the Sacrament, but in their breach of vnitie, wherof the Sacrament was a mystrie, and in other their manifold disorder.

That at such feastes they receiued the Sacrament, either before other meates after S. Chrysostomes mynde, or after other meates as thopinion of some is, I deny not. But by the words, waite ye one for an other, it is not meant that the Corinthians should not receiue the sacrament without a number of communicantes, but that they should not go to their banquet, and eate by their common meates by seuerall companies, the richer and nobler for by them selues, but waite and targe for the poore, and admit them charitably

Chrys. in
1. Cor. 11.

The meaning of S. Pauls words, waite ye one for an other.

A Reioindre to

ably and humbly to be partakers of their table, as Christ admitted al his Apostles to be partakers of his table indifferently. To be short S. Paule there doth not exhort or stirre the Corinthians to a publike Communion, or to the receiuing of the Sacrament to a number, but to charitie, indifferencie, meeknesse, equal regard of their poore brethren, humilitie, moderation & sobrietie. As for the Sacrament, he speaketh of it, but briefly, and as it were by the waye, that by the example of Christs supper, wherein he gaue the Sacrament to al, & admitted al to his table indifferently, he might bring the Corinthians to the like vertue & indifferencie, to be vsed in their accustomed Church-fraites, where specially vnitie, the fruit obtained by the worthy receiuing of the Sacrament the mystrie of Vnitie, was to be exercised.

Israel.

In other places S. Augustine like as also S. Hierome and others, write, that he whole people daily received together, and generally intreating of the holy Communion, he speaketh euermore of a number, and neuer of one alone.

Handling.

we dispute not now what was done, but whether number of Communicantes together sacramentally be of Christs precept or Institution, and so of necessitie: whether if others fail, the priest may not be suffered to receive that common benefite the vitall of life. If he may, the is our case cleare, that in S. Hieromes & S. Augustines time many commonly, & al the people sometimes received together, I denie not. The same deuotion we wish hartely it were in the people now. And if it were, yet would ye not be content therewith, such a desyre ye haue to vndoo that the Church holdeth for good, and to preferre your new fangled fantasies. And whereas oftentimes you allege the places of the Fathers, that make mention of the Sacrament receiued by the whole people, why do you not bring your whole people to your Communion?

The state
of this
whole
Article.

munition? why admitte you that to be a good and lawfull Communion, whereat thye only receiue? Either bring al to it, or allege no more the Fathers speaking of al, or blame your owne sect, as wel as the catholike Church. For if al the people be requisite to a right and due Communion, then are they of your congregations to blame, among whom thye receiuing together be allowed. Reason it is, ye amend your owne faultes, before ye reprove others.

That S. Hierome speaketh of some, who in his time at Rome receined alone in their houses, I do most plainly shewe in my booke out of his owne wordes. Though S. Augustin speake neuer, (likewise) which I graunt not, yet thereof you can not conclude, that it ought not to be receined of one alone, as you seme here to conclude. For this is a simple argument, you knowe, S. Augustine neuer speaketh of sole receining, ergo it is not lawfull to receiue alone. I marvel, that you were so much ouerseene, as thorough your whole Replie to make such loose reasons. As for that which foloweth in the next Paragraphe, I neede not to answer it, seeing that you charge me vntreuly with that I say not. Your seeming and surmising there of that which I touch not, serueth you only for stuffing towards the heape.

the whole
people do
not Com-
municate
together
among the
gospellers

In Apolog.
aduersus
Iovinianum
Fol. 20. a

But if the Church haue determined this matter for Priuate Masse, as M. Harding saith, in vyhat Councel, at vyhat time within vi. Centes after Christe, and in vyhat place was it determined? Wyho was witnessse of the doing? Wyho was president, wyho was present? This is that the Reader would faine learne. And M. Harding thinketh it best to proue it by silence. How be it, it is confessed, that Priuate Masse came in, not by Christe, or by any of his Apostles, or by the authoritie of the Church, but only by the vndeuation and negligence of the people.

Harding.

Here is much ado, and many idle questions demanded.

b u

It

A Reioindre to

It hath ben not without cause commonly said in Schooles, an Assc may aske moe questions, then Aristotle is hable to answer. If I were disposed so to appose you M. Jewel, it were easy to requit you with no smal number of questions touching your new deuised Gospel, wherevnto I am wel assured you can not with any colour of reason or learning answer. Albeit I nede not to repete them here againe. You be not vnmindful I dare say of the questions, which by way of your owne chalenge M. Maste hath proponed vnto you, and requireth your Answer vnto them, in the ende of his Confutation of your Sermon. It standeth you vpon, and vpon the estimation of your whole Gospel, that you satisfie the world with some reasonable Answer thereto. Els you shal cause al men to suspect your whole doctrine and preaching. For shame defende not your cause so with silence, and with putting good men in prison for hauing our treatises. Until you answer those Articles, ye are like to be on the losers syde.

M. Re-
sels Cha-
lenge to
M. Jew.
not yet an-
swered.

But as concerning your questions, I wil not altogether follow you. To them al thus I answer. Pryuate Masse, that is to say the Pryestes sole receiuing, we acknowledge. But that Masse is pryuate, being take for the Sacrifice, we do not acknowledge. As touching that you cal Pryuate Masse, to wit the Sole receiuing of the priest, it is sufficiently determined by the long practise of church, and why it ought not so to be done, there is no prohibition in the scripture to the contrary. The Sacrifice of the Masse, which we defende, that is to say, the vnbloody Oblation of the body and blood of Christe, is by our Sauour Christe himselfe determined. who as I haue sufficiently before proued, at his last supper after he had taken bread and wine into his handes, geuen thanks, blessed, and consecrated his body and blood, and deliuered to them which were present: said to his Apostles, and in them to their successors priestes, of the new Testament,

ment, Do ye this in my remembrance. And thereby he taught (as I. Irenaeus saith) the new Oblation of the new testament.

Irenaeus

lib. 4. ca. 32

This the Apostles receiued of him, the church of the Apostles, and (as that blessed Martyr S. Irenaeus reporteth) offereth it to God in the whole world. For this I haue no need to alleg any Council. The time was the night when he was betrayed. The place was the chamber in Ierusalem, where he kept his Maundy. The witnesses of the doing were the three Evangelistes. S. Matthew, Marke, and Luke, and S. Paule. Christ him selfe was President, the Apostles were present. Thus you haue the matter for the blessed Sacrifice determined, and your questions answered.

That we distribute not the Sacrament to a number of others, as Christ did, that is of the imperfection of them, who refuse to frequent that benefite, not of any default of our parte, which vnderuotion of others & not receiuing, maketh not private Masse, but is cause that the priest at Masse receiue alone, and make no distribution, which ye cal private Masse. You heare the people in hande, that private Masse as ye cal it, came in, not by Christ, nor by the Apostles, nor by auctoritie of the Church, but only by vnderuotion and negligence of the people. And so ye would haue it seme enill, because as you pretende, it proceedeth of enill.

But this is wicked and false sophistrie, whereby you begyle the vblearned people, neither is it confessed, that private Masse proceeded of the peoples vnderuotion and negligence, neither in dede therof proceeded it at al. Christ is the author of the blessed Masse touching the substance of it, as now I haue declared. But the lacke of others to communicate with the priest, and that none oftentimes be disposed to receiue with him, that proceedeth of vnderuotion, and negligence. Of this imperfection or negligence the Masse taketh not his name, much lesse his be-

b. iiij

ing, alone.

Thomas taketh not his name of the imperfection of the people, yet through it the priest sometime receiveth

A Reioindre to

ing. In dede because other be negligent, and do not Communicate with the Priest; for that cause the Priest receiveth alone, which the Gospellers cal private Masse: but that is not the cause of Masse, be it named private, or how so ever it be named. That it is Masse, it is of Christes Institution, that it is private, or rather that the participation or receiving of the Oblation is private, or singular to the Priest, that is through the occasion of the peoples vndeuation and negligence.

In what
sense it
may be
said, the
negligence
of the peo-
ple is cau-
se of pri-
vate masse

To make this plaine by an example. It may be said, Lacke of tribute maketh a poore king. Shal we herof conclude that a king cometh to his Crowne by his Subiectes withdrawing of tribute? The French king of late yeres had not his tribute, custome, and rentes, duly payd and leuied, through the rebellion of the Huguenots, and thereof grew poore. Shal we in consideration herof say, that rebellion made a poore king? No, rebellion made not a poore king, for then had it made a king: but rebellion made the French king poore. For the king was made of God. Neither came he in by rebellion, but by right of succession and inheritance. yet by a manner of common speech we may say, that rebellion maketh a poore prince. where by is meant that it bringeth pouertie, not a kingly state to a king. Euen so though the vndeuation and negligence of the people be a cause, why the Priest at Masse many times receiveth the blessed Sacrament alone, (for which cause the Gospellers cal the Masse private, whereas they should cal it rather private receiving, for the Masse that notwithstanding is both for the mater, and for the Minister publike and common): yet is not that the cause of Masse, but only that the Masse is celebrated without a compaignie of communicantes together. It maketh not private Masse, but it maketh the Masse after their terming, to be private. So that private Masse as they cal it, proceeded not, ne came not in by

by the negligence of the people, as **M. Jewel** goeth about with his sophistrie to perswade the unlearned, but by **Christe**, as I have said, whose example is witnesse of a number Communicating together in one place, to whom then he deliuered a forme of administration, which they should afterward solowe, but the same touching number, was not a commaundement. For as the hauing of number to receiue with the Priest, maketh no part of the substance of the Masse, nor bettereth the same: euen so the lacke of receiuers murthereth not the substance, nor any whit impairerth the same. For the substance is both in one.

Here I omitte the great adoo and scoffing that **M. Jewel** maketh at the Catholikes, for the constructions, which they make (as he helpeth them) of these wordes of **S. Paule**, *cetera cum venero, disponam*. Touching the rest, I wil take order when I come. There he beareth men in hand that vpon these wordes we build **Private Masse**, and maketh **S. Paule** to tel a foolish tale, as though he were a Wise in an enterlude, made by some Minister of their Gospel. which I contemne, as almost al the rest of his vaine babling Replie, and thinke it not indee worthy of answer.

Page. 11.
paragr. 1.
7. 4.
1. Cor. 11.

Jewel.

I may not now dissemble the value of **M. Hardinges** argument. **Christe** (saith he) ordeined the sacrament after consecration and oblation done, to be receiued and eaten. Ergo the number of Communicantes together is no parte of **Christes** institution. What thought **M. Harding** that none but children and fooles should read his booke? For how loosely hang these partes together? The sacrament must be receiued after Consecration: Ergo, The number of Communicantes is not necessary. There is not one peece hereof that either is true in it selfe, or agreeth vvith other.

The. 70.
vnttruth.
It is not
my argu-
ment.

The. 71.
vnttruth.
For some
part is
proued to
be true.

Harding.

what say you **M. Jewel**? Is there not one peece of that I

h. iij.

haue.

A Reioindre to

Mr. Jew. have here said true in it selfe: Be you wel advised what you say, or hath the spirite of malice against the catholike Church caried you out of your wittes? Is not this true, Christ ordeined the Sacrament after consecration and oblation done to be receiued? Do you not allege *Gabriel Biel* your selfe for proufe thereof within fewe lines?

When you come to your right minde again, you wil reuoke this, I am sure, and say it was spoken vnaduisably. For els let manducate and bibite, eate ye, and drinke ye, be taken out of the Gospel, wel this peece then is true. Now let vs see, how the argument that may be gathered out of my wordes, holdeth together. Let **Mr. Jew** loose it if he can. My argument I wil make my selfe. It is easy for a scoffer to scoffe at argumentes framed of his owne scoffing head. Take none other but mine owne argumentes **Mr. Jew**, and handle them, as your scoffing head thinketh best, I geue you leaue. But to deuise peruisly argumentes of your owne, and to farther them vpon me: it shal appeare a penisly practise, to al that shal perceiue it. For thinke not good Sir, that al be childen, or fooles, or fond fauourers of your owne pleasant gospel, that shal read your booke. Some wise men may happen to see your vneuen dealing, your immoderate lying, your ambitious affectation of learning, your wilful peruertering of truth, and your other euil demeanour, in whose iudgement you shal neuer reconer credite.

An argument proposed to **Mr. Jew** to be considered.

My argument then is this. Touching the blessed Sacrament due mater, forme, minister, and intent presupposed, what so euer is beside Consecration, Oblation, & receiuing, which I vnderstand by Participation: is no part of Christs Institutiō, but is left to the disposition of the church. The number of Communicantes together in one place, is beside these thre so named: Ergo the number of Communicants together is no part of Christs Institutiō.

Thus

Thus you haue that by one argument concluded, which you so often haue denyed *M. Jewels*. Scoffe no more at my argument. If the conclusion like you not, the argument being good: what haue you here to denye, but the *minor* of second proposition: That the number of Communicantes together in one place, is a parte of Christs Institution, which is denyed in the *minor*, in this very Disussion you take vpon you to proue, for that these wordes, take ye, eate ye, drinke ye al, &c. *im-* Page 20.
 porte a number. But how weake that proufe is, I haue now *par-3.*
 sufficiently shewed. You must get you better proufe then Christs speaking to many in the plural number, or els yelde to the truth, and admitte the conclusion of my Argument. At least until you proue it, which you shal neuer do, sint your railing and barking at the blessed Sacrifice of the Church, and so yelde by silence, where speaking or writing anaileth you nothing. If you presse vpon your number, consider to whom and to how many it was spoken. It was spoke to the Apostles being twelue in number, wherfore it must be deliuered to such, and to no more. And so the Rattle by you is cleane excluded, and the Church giuen to a vaine precisenesse of number.

Now (that I may follow *M. Jewels* kind of eloquence) I may not dissemble the valew of *M. Jewels* argument.

These wordes (saith he) Take ye, eate ye, drinke ye, &c. can not be taken of one singular man, but necessarily im-
 porte a number: Ergo Christ hath by special wordes ap-
 pointed a number (of Communicantes together). so much is to be vnderstanded, els we agree. For that so many as be worthily proued and disposed, should Communicate, we graunt and wish. But that they should Communicate together, that is to say in one place, that we denye Christs wordes to importe. For by like reason (as I haue before

M. Jewels argument for necessitie of a number to receiue the Communion together.

A Reioindre to

declared) Chyistes other commaundementes geuen to the Apostles in the plural number, import also signification of number together. And so one might not preach alone, baptise alone, absolue alone, nor do any thing geuen in commaundement by Chyiste in woordes of the plurall number: except moe were alwayes together, in the same place. which is very sonde and absurde, and the Apostles neuer obserued it, who at length were diuided a sunder into diuers coastes of the world, and didde preach, baptise, remitte sinnes, and other dueties appertaining to their vocation, when none els in those functions made vp a number with them.

What thought you M. Jewel, when you made this Argument, that none but Children and fooles should reade your booke? How hang these partes together? Chyiste said speaking to moe then one, Eate ye, drinke ye. Ergo, one may not eate and drinke the Sacrament alone. By like Logike, a man may reason thus, Chyiste said to al, Venite ad me omnes, Come ye to me al, Ergo no man or woman may come to Chyiste, except al go together with him. And so no one person may euer go to Chyiste, because he shal neuer finde al ready to go with him. I woulde not thus trifle with you, if I sawe any better mater then very trifles in you.

Mat. 11.

And how can it be otherwise, sith that your grounde is not truth? And how can falshed be upholden and maintained against truth, but with Argumentes of vntruch, and with groundlesse trifles?

Iewel.

Concerning the force of M. Hardings Argument, it concludeth directly against him selfe. For if Chyiste infused the Sacrament to

the

the intent it should be first consecrated, and then receiued of a company: it must needs follow, that receiuing with companie is parte of Christs Institution.

Harding.

Lorde what impudencie is there in this man? He hath caused his printer to put into his booke my wordes by sundry Diuisions, and yet in the same place, where he commeth to replye against them: he falsifieth and misreporteth them. Take lying and falsified from his booke, and truly the rest may seeme a shaldeale. Contrarywise let him followe the vaine of his accustomed impudencie in Lying, and what number of Paper may not be blotte? where say I, that Christs instituted the Sacrament to the intent it should be first Consecrated and then receiued of a companie. or with a companie together in one place? for so he meaneth & so he maketh his conclusion. Say not I expressly the contrary? Be not these my wordes? The number of Communicantes together in one place, that they tangle so much of, is no parte of Christs Institution. Item, Christs ordeined the Sacrament after Consecration and Oblation done, to be receiued and eaten, and for that ende he said, Accipite, manducate, bibite. Take, eat, drinke. Wherein con- sisteth his Institution.

Now where is the necessity of your companie by me spoken of in al these wordes? If it be not, but if the contrary be spoken, why had you rather to seme impudent in lying, then not to reproue me for my Argument, or rather for your argument? for mine is is not as you report it. And here must you arguent of your booke be painted al ouer with my pooze name; to bring it into hatred & contempt. M. Harding concludeth against him self. M. Harding's argument.

The, 72.
intrudeth.
this is a
very
grosse fal-
sifying of
my say-
ing.

This fal-
shed of
M. Jew.
can by no
colour be
excused.

In my
answers
fol. 12. b.

I burden
of lies.

A Reioindre to

argument, M. Harding hath forgotten him selfe. M. Harding is a
flesh at the ordinance of Christe, &c.

Whereby M. Jewel you are lustily amuzzed among them,
of whom the Prophet say speaketh. Posuimus mendacium
spem nostram, & mendacio protecti sumus. We haue put our
trust in lying, and lying is our Protection. If you had forborne
lying, your booke had growen to a smal quantitie. Yea you
might haue holden your peace. But this is that smoke and
smoother I forswore and spake of in my Conclusion to you,
which by Gods grace shal soon vanish awaye, the light of the
Truth dyming awaye the darkenes of your Eyes. To con-
clude, I saye, the Sacrament ought to be receiued, and would
God that alwaies a number were worthily proued, examined
and disposed to receiue. But that a number be alwayes toge-
ther in one place to receiue, that is not of Christe expressly
commanded, nor is contained in his Institution. The con-
trary whereof if you proue not M. Jewel, leaue your barking
against the Church, for that the Priest receiueth alone, when
others be not disposed to receiue with him.

The Ninth Diuision.

The effect
of my
wordes in
the 9. Di-
uision.

The effect of my wordes, which M. Jewel hath placed
in his 9. Diuision, is an answer to the common obie-
ction of Chykses example, that we ought to deliuer the
Sacrament to a number together, because Christe so did at his
Supper. whereto I say there, that we are bounde to followe
the example of Christe, for so much as concerneth the substance
of

of the Sacrament, nor the outward ceremonies, to which number pertaineth. Also that, in case of the peoples slackenes, the Priest notwithstanding, ought to do his dutie.

M. Iewel in his Replie to this, would seme to touch the very point, but in dede he shooteth at randon, and commeth nought nigh the Butte, where the scope and marke of our matter is. And because he bestoweth many wooordes to litle purpose, to confute them, I entend not to bestow long time, reseruing my labour for pointes of more pich and substance.

Iewel.

The question that lyeth betwene vs, standeth not in this point, whether we ought to do every thing that Christe did: but whether we ought to do that thing, that Christe both did him selfe, and also commaunded us to do, &c.

Harding.

Now that you are come to the question it selfe, I trust you wd not rone abroade as you have done hitherto, but speake to the purpose, and avoid al superfluous talke. yet, then what say you to it?

Iewel.

Christe said not, Do this in Ierusalem, or in this Parler, or after Supper, or at this table, or being so many together, or standing, or sitting, but he said thus, Do ye this: that is, Take ye Breads; blesse it, break it, geue it in my remembrance. This is not a Ceremonial Accident, but the very ende, purpose, and substance of Christes Institution.

Harding.

Hete commeth me in this newe Enangelist, I wote not from whence, and foxlooth parerth away al the ceremonial accidentes of the Supper, and letereth forth nothing but the very ende, purpose, and substance of Christes Institution, A substan-

c u

tial

A Reioindre to

that Doctor, I warrant you Christian Readers, ye may beleue him, if ye will. For he goeth to the substance of the matter.

Christe (saith he) said not thus, but he said thus, Do ye this in my remembrance. And what this, meant he, we should do? Mary saith this new Euangelist, that we take Breaðe, blasse it, breake it, and geue it. Why Sir by your fauour, shal we fare no better at your Supper? If this be al the substance of your banquet, and of Christes Institution, as you tel vs, we thinke it a smal pitaunce, to haue nothing but Breaðe. O saith he, this now is not common Breaðe, it is holy Breaðe, for it is conuerted to an holy use, it is Sacramental breaðe, it is tokening breaðe, for it is a token, a signe, a figure, or a signification of the Lords Body that is in heauen, &c. O Sir, Iewel, begile not the people of God, for whom Christ gave his Body. Serue them not with signes and tokens, which can not fede their hungry soules, but with the thing it selfe. Ye bereue them of the best dish, the body of Christ without which your symbolical, tokening, & figurative breaðe profiteth them nothing. And Sir I pray you, is this the substance of Christes Institution? If so haue you not falsified, corrupted, and belied his blessed Institution? Where is the chiefe grace and gift, Hoc est corpus meum, This is my Body?

You blame me (though without cause as I haue before proued) that vskening the essentiall partes of Christes Institution, I spake more of the Annuntiation of our Lords death, which in deepe is done by speaking of Consecration, Oblation, and Receiuing. And shal you escape blame for leauing quite out the Body and Bloude of Christ, where you speake of the substance of his Institution? What haue you there, if you haue not the substance of his Body and Bloud? Do these wordes, Do ye this, import nomore but a request, to take Breaðe, blasse it, breake it, and geue it? Why then chere or foure good felowes

Q. I. c. v. pretending to speake of the substance of Christes Supper, leaueth quite out the body and bloud of Christe, & setteth fourth breaðe, and cherries, makinge whole banquets.

Supra fol.

of your Congregation having a cake by a crackerel before them
in a Wancue, may celebrate your Communion whiles the Tap-
ster is filling a quarte of wine. For what let is there? who can
not take bread? who can not breake it, and geue it to his compa-
nions? As for blessing, if you meane no more but saying of a pray-
er, (for the Consecration of y^e Church you allow not) they may
some geate a Ladde or a girls to say grace at the table.

Q. M. Jewell, that you restraine Chrystes commandement.
Do ye this, to taking, blessing, breaking and geuing bread. where
is the word of Consecration, This is my Body, this is my blood,
by which he consecrated his body and blood? Are not they con-
tained under Doye this? If ye do not consecrate, and by the al-
mighty power of the word, the bread and wine changed into
an other most excellent substance, make really present the Body
and Blood of Chryste, as he did him selfe at his supper: how do
you performe and fulfil this commandement, Do ye this? If
you thinke it necessary to be done, what falshood, what malice,
what Devilish wickednesse is it for you to obscure it, to
hyspe it, to put it out of memorie, to abolishe it by wilfull om-
ission?

A. By like your aduise was given to the seaming of the Eng-
lish Churches Communion at Geneua, which was printed there,
wherein the wordes of Consecration be omitted, least the
people by rehearsal of them should be moved to thinke, that
there is some alteration made in the Bread and wine. So ye
have put away and made void the commandement and Insti-
tution of Chryste, to set up and establish your owne Traditions.

Q. Ye charge vs with robbing the people of the one kinde
in the administration of the Sacrament. How much more
justly may we charge you for robbing them of both kinds?

In 29.
Jewels
description
of Chrysts
Supper
chiefe sub-
stance is
put away.

The 28.
of the En-
glish
Church
at Geneua
leaueth
out the
wordes of
Conse-
cration.

A Reioindre to

For if in Christs commaundement and wordes of his Institution, ye include not the Consecration of his Body and Bloud, whereby they are made present through the omnipotence of his word: then geue ye to the people in steede of the most precious gifte of his Body and Bloud, nothing but Breađe and wine. God sende you to Seneca againe. (I feare me he wil sende you to Gehena) with y^e doctrine, if ye mind not to change your opinion. Surely the holy Ghost neuer taught it, the Church neuer receiued it of the Apostles, in al the holy Fathers we finde the contrary.

But Sir, if we would admitter your exposition of Christs wordes, Do ye this, (as we do not admitter in no wise) what conclude you? we take Breađe, we blesse, we breake, we geue. What more wil ye haue of vs? If this be the very ende, purpose, and substance of Christs Institution, as you say, it is as if we do al this at our Masse, why professe you such open hatred against it? why worke you al the spite you can, against it? why do you despise it worse then any Turke, Saracen, Jewe, or Infidel? why backe you at it with wordes, viler then the barking of any Dogge? why do you abhorre it no lesse then the Angels of Satan? From whence bloweth this wicked and blasphemous spirit?

But say you, we geue it not. Yea forsooth Sir, we are alwayes willing, desirous, and ready, to geue it to al faithful persons being in case worthily to receiue it with vs and demanding the same, and sometimes we do actually geue it to certaine being wel disposed. And when none is disposed, wee receiue alone, and geue it eche one to our selues in the dreadfull mysteries. And of our parte touching this behalfe, this is enough. And thus is the Institution and commaundement of Christ, who said, Do ye this, kept and obserued.

If you say, it is broken, because we receive it not with a number, I tel you againe once for al, a number were to be wished in dede at al times, yet is the same ceremonial, not essential. I meane, it pertaineth to the ceremonie of eating, and to further honour of the Sacrament, but it is not so of the Institution, as it may not be at any time received of the Priest without number of Communicantes together with him in one place, under paine of deadly sinne. You say, the number is of the substance of the institution, and of necessitie: but you prove it not. Say it no more so often, but prove it once, least you seme lib to repeat one song like a Cuckow.

Jewel.

Yet saith M. Harding, we are bound to follow Christes example in things that be of the substance of the Sacrament, not in things that be of order and congruence. Here unavwares be smeth to confesse that his Masse vvaht so euer substance it beare, yet is void both of good order, and also of congruence.

Harding.

You wrangle M. Jewel. You seeke al the occasion you can, to speake evil of me, and blasphemously of the blessed Sacrifice of the Masse. This to do, at least in some shewe, you falsifie my wordes, and hauing made me to speake as is for your scoffing purpose: you handle me as it liketh you. And this is your custome through al your booke, to repote my wordes otherwise then I do, and then to carpe them. But what should I complaine of private iniurie? Your vnt ruth and falsifying is not extended to my wordes onely, but also to the wordes of the auncient and holy Fathers of the Church, yea to the wordes of our Sauour Christ him self, as euē here a litle before I shewed.

But sith there is no plainenesse nor sinceritie in you, I re-
pote me to the discret Reader, whether it may be gathered of my

d j

wordes

The 77th
vnt ruth.
I seme
not to con-
fesse any
such thing

A Reioindre to

Fol. 13. a.

wordes that I confesse the Masse to be both of order and congruence. Speaking of Christes example touching the administration of the blessed Sacrament, I say, we are bounde to follow it, for the substance, not for the outward ceremony, to the which pertaineth number, and other rites. Then I say further by way of explication: Christes example importeth necessitie of receiving onely, (I meane after Consecration and Oblation done) the other rites, as number, place, time, &c. be of congruence and order. I would faine understande what he the wordes here, whereof M. Jewel gathered his scoffing conclusion, that I seeme to confesse, that the Masse, (which in spire he calleth my Masse) is void both of good order, and also of congruence. But common scoffers and lea- sers challenge to them selues a libertie, to speake what they list without control.

And Sir if I say, we are not bounde to followe the example of Christe in thinges, which then were of order and congruence: do I confesse that the Masse is void both of good order, and also of congruence? That Christe at his supper after he had consecrated his Body, gaue it to a number, it was of order and congruence. For if he had geuen it but to one onely, as to S. Peter, or S. John: the rest might haue thought them selues little regarded. If he had geuen it to some and not to al, there should haue appeared partialitie, and grudge thereof would haue folowed. And where as they were al made Priestes at that Supper, and were taught a foyme of the administration of the Sacrament: it was of order and congruence, that they should be partakers, yea they onely without the companie of any women.

That the Supper was kept in the Citie of Ierusalem, in a seluely eating chamber dressed vp for that purpose, that the true
Lambe

Lambe which takech away the sinnes of the worlde, was offered eaten after the typical or figurative Lambe of the old law, that the Sacramentes of both Lawes to mette together; that this precious deinty was last of al geuen, after Supper, a litle before Chyriste was taken away from their presence: al this was of order and congruence. To these obseruances the example of Chyriste doth not binde vs. And shal we say therefore, that Masse is void both of al good order & also of congruence? Now weigh this argument: good Reader, which M. Jewel for lacke of honest Logike, maketh here with his scoffing Rhetorike.

M. Jew.
argument
in effect.

That we celebrate Masse duly, we are not bounde vnder paine of deadly sinne to the ceremonials of Chyristes example at his Supper: Ergo the Masse is void of al good order and congruence. Such Logike becommeth such a canse. Like doctrine, like prouses. This falshe is best defended by falshe.

Now M. Jewel you haue said al that euer you could say, for that a number ought alwaies to communicate together with the Priest. And yet you haue not proued it. If you wil needes holde that opinion, and not geue ouer: remember that you seke new prouses, for al that you haue yet brought, serueth not your turne. Conferre with your brethren, and learne, whether any better reasons may be founde for prouise thereof, then hitherto you haue made. Hereon dependeth the whole case. You should haue debated this point more pithily & more at large. Your bare worde, and bolde affirmation without iust prouise, wil no more be taken for the Gospel. And if you faile of sufficient prouise for this point, then may we iustly require you to yeelde and subscribe.

That both you may beare it away, and others deeply thinke of it, the thing I standeth you vpon clearly to proue is this.

• • •

That

what is
that M.
Jewel
hath to
proue, and
proueth
not.

A Reioindre to

That a number of Communicantes together in one place is so absolutely necessary, that a Priest after Consecration and Oblation done, may not in any wise receiue the blessed Sacramente except there be a number to communicate Sacramentally with him in the same place. Until this be proued, private Masse as you terme it, is not disproued. That is to say, this remaineth laudful and godly, that a Priest do consecrate & offer vp to God the Body and Bloud of Christe in that order as the Church vseth, and receiue it alone, when others be not disposed to receiue it with him.

This much belongeth to you clearly and evidently to proue both for your owne private credites sake, and for the credite of your Gospel. which if you do not, and that substantially, farre otherwise then you haue done in your vaine babling, & lying Reaplye: you shal cause as wel that parte, as the rest of your newe doctrine, generally to be suspected.

After this M. Jewel being loth to tary long in the weightiest point, which required most learning and best discusssion, conueiecth him self away to rayling and finding fault with the Church for other thinges not specially by me spoken of in my Answer to his First Article: The Latine tongue, the Priestles turning of his face from the people, Ceremonies, which he termeth infinite and childish, al these he repponeth, saying that al these be holden for thinges substantial, but falsly he saith it, as likewise most lyingly and impudently, that we haue power to change accident into substance, and substance into accident, when we liste. These, and the like vaine railings and lyes, wherewith his booke is stuffed, if I would passe ouer vnanswered, I mighte soon make an ende. Of them al, leaning aparte the lightest, I saie woulde I see, of what value be his sayinges of most weight.

In this Division as it followeth, he cryeth out O miserable upon the Church of Rome, and the whole Colledge of Cardinals, for that they be not disposed to receive the Communion, so often as the Priestes say Masse. I would he went to Rome, and tolde them that, whereby he might amend al that is amisse.

As he goeth forth, he sheweth his wil to be, that receiving of the Communion be, as common as prayer. *Whosoever is a member of Christe* (saith he) *and may boldly cal God his Father, may also be bolde to receive the Communion.* As though through occasion

of such bolde preachers and teachers, many toke not themselves for the members of Christ, which be the members of Antichrist, and many ful boldly called not God their Father, to whom God may say, as he saith by the Prophet Malachias, *Sie ego sum pater, ubi honor meus?* If I be your Father, where is my honour? But how boldesoeuer M. Jewels companis be oftentimes to receive y^e Communion, the godly & devout Catholike people tremble and feare, when they come to that most holy table, to receive the very body of their maker in forme of Bread, and make an earnest and careful preparation long before, that they come not unworthily. They proue them selves most diligently before they presume to eate of that divine Bread, lest they should eate it to their condemnation. And this is the cause why they be houseled more seldome, then they were in the Primitive Church. Yet y^e they be in many places over slacke & cold herein, I denye not. Neither do I wholly excuse them, by whom they should be stirred to receive that greate benefite oftener. But what is that to the abrogation of the Masse? Among other thinges I marvel what he meaneth, where speaking of the daily Sacrifice of the Church, wherein the Priest offereth by Christe unto his Father, he calleth it a wanton folie, and saith thus.

Malach. 1.

The cause why they receive more seldome now, then they did in the Primitive Church.

A Reioindre to

Iewel.

The. 74.
Untruth.
It hath
ben thos
ughly be
leued.

The mater being so vveighty, and not yet thoroughly beleued, it had ben good for M. Harding to haue made proufe thereof by the auctoritie of S. Augustine, S. Hierome, or some other olde Catholike Doctor, vvithin the compasse of six hundred yeares.

Harding.

As though I had not done this already in my Answer to the . 17. Article. But it semeth M. Jewel, you care not what you say, so you say that is fl, and false of me. The mater is vveighty and not thoroughly beleued you say. The weightier it is, the moze danger is to them that beleue it not. Whom you meane I know not: but if your selfe be he, that beleueth it not, as I may easily beleue that: You should not haue said, not yet thoroughly beleued, but not now thoroughly beleued. For once you beleued it, as al the Catholike Church beleueth, but now that belefe you haue forsaken, and at this present beleue it not. If you wil beleue the auncient Fathers, who both beleued it, and spake most plainely of it: them you may see and read by me alleged vpon your seuentienth Article, & in this present Treatise herte before.

But touching this Article, you wil not beleue me, nor the Fathers, nor the whole Church, nor Christe him selfe: who by verditte of al the Fathers, both by his exāple at his last supper, and by these expresse wordes, Do ye this in my remembrance, commaunded his Apostles, and in them their successours to offer vp vnto God his Body and Bloud in the holy Mysteries, and taught as

Irenaeus
lib. 4. c. 32.

S. Irenaeus saith, The new Oblation of the new Testament. Wherefore though I make proufe of the vnblondy Sacrifice neuer so sufficiently, though for witness and declaration of the Churches saith therein, I allege neuer so many Doctours, as it is easy to allege in manner al that euer wroote: al this wil not help

helpe you, it is not I, nor the authoritie of any Father, that can bring light or wisdom into your darke and malicious soule, malicious I meane against the Church, but it is onely he that first diuided light fro darkenes, the Creator of light, and iudge of the workes of darkenesse. If he do it not, it is vaine labour for men to trauail with you. To his mercifull iudgement I recommend you. I had rather pray for you, then haue to do with you. Onely for the deceiued peoples sake, I do that I do.

Because I say, the vnbloody Sacrifice is to be celebrated daily, to the intent the bloody Sacrifice once made on the Crosse for redemption of mankind may be kept in memorie: herof M. Jewel taketh occasion to enter into a common place, concerning these wordes daily Sacrifice. wherein his purpose is to abolish the memorie of that, which the Church calleth as the fathers do, the daily Sacrifice, meaning the blessed Sacrifice of the Masse, wherein the memorie of Christs death is daily renewed. To this purpose he allegeth certaine places out of Doctrines, in which a continuance of the benefite of Christs death and resurrection is signified. By which places he concludeth nothing against the Daily Sacrifice. His wordes be these.

Daily Sacrifice.

Jewel.

The olde Fathers cal that the Daily Sacrifice, that Christe made once for al vpon the Crosse: for that as Christ is a Priest for euer, so doth the same his Sacrifice last for euer: not that it is daily and really renewed of any mortal creature, but that the power and vertue thereof is infinite in it selfe, and shal neuer be consumed.

The 75. vntiuth. The fathers cal not the Sacrifice of the Crosse the daily Sacrifice.

Harding.

That the olde Fathers cal the Sacrifice, once made vpon the Crosse, the Daily Sacrifice, I heare you say it, but I heare you not proue it, That which you bring for proufe, reporteth it to

a iij.

be:

A Reioindre to

In Sa-
crifice two
things
are to be
considered

be of time everlasting, and of verue infinite, which no man de-
nyeth. Yet here are two things to be considered touching
this worde Sacrifice, The thing Sacrificed, and the act of Sa-
crificing. The thing Sacrificed is Christe, as he was man, of
the Body of Christe. The same is of power and verue infi-
nite, of time everlasting. The act of Sacrificing is Chris-
tes Passion, whereby is wrought our Redemption. This act
and real Passion, was done but once vpon the Crosse: and ther-
fore can not properly be called dayly. For it began & ended with-
in compasse of a certaine place, and certaine time. Yet the ver-
ue of it lasteth for ever. Both are called by the name of Sa-
crifice.

August.
Epist. 23.

Now the Body of Christ is called of the Fathers, the dai-
ly Sacrifice, not in consideration that it was once sacrificed vpon
the Crosse, but for the commemoration & memorie of it is dai-
ly renewed in the Masse, and it selfe mystically Sacrificed. For
in the Masse the same thing, that is to say, the same Body, is of-
fered, but after an other manner of offering, then that was vpon
the Crosse. S. Augustine speaketh distinctly and plainly of
both these Sacrifices. Nonne semel Christus Oblatus est in semet-
ipso, & tamen in Sacramento, non solum per omnes Pasche so-
lennitates, sed omni die populis immolatur? Was not Christe
offered vp once in him selfe, and yet in the Sacrament he is sacri-
ficed for the people, not onely at euery Easter feast, but euery
day? The Sacrifice once made vpon the Crosse, S. Augus-
tine calleth Christe once Sacrificed in him selfe, that is to saye,
in his visible and passible Body with shedding of his bloude.
The Sacrificing of the same Christe for the people, in the Sa-
crament, he calleth Quotidianam immolationem, The daily Sa-
crifice. And this is that I named the daily Sacrifice, as S.
Augustine and al other Catholikes do.

Of this daily Sacrifice S. Augustine speaketh very plainly
 ly in an other place, by whom we may understand what it is. Contra
 Fanſum
 Manich.
 The Hebrewes (saith he) in the sacrifices of beastes, which they
 offred to God, by many and sundry wayes, as it was meete for so
 great a thing, did celebrate a prophetic of the Sacrifice to come, lib. 20.
 cap. 18.
 which Christe hath offred. Wherefore now the Christians do re-
 lebrate the memorie of the same Sacrifice done, by the holy obla-
 tion and participation of the body and blood of Christe.

Consider this wel reader. That Sacrifice which was made
 vpon the crosse, in the place before alleged of S. Augustine is
 called, Christe offred in him selfe. here it is called in respect of
 the olde Hebrewes, the Sacrifice to come, in respect of the Chri-
 stians that be now, the Sacrifice already done. But that Sacri-
 fice whereof the controuersie is betwene the Sacramentaries and
 vs, there of S. Augustine is called the daily Sacrifice of Christe
 in the Sacrament: Here the celebration of the memorie of the
 Sacrifice already done. And least any man should thinke this
 Sacrifice to be a memorie only, or a celebration and keeping of
 that memorie only, without the thing whose memorie is kept,
 to put that quite out of doubt: S. Augustine addeth, sacrosancta
 oblatione & participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi, with
 the holy Oblation and Participation of the body and blood of
 Christe.

In the Masse then that which we speake so much of, which
 M. Jewel impugneth, by S. Augustines description, is the cele-
 bration of the memorie, or a solemne commemoration of the Sa-
 crifice once done vpon the Crosse, made with the holy Oblation
 and partaking of the body and blood of Christe. This Sacrifice
 for that it is Daily made, is named the Daily Sacrifice, And it
 is a Sacrament of the bloody Sacrifice, a sacrifice commemo-
 ration or representative of the Sacrifice done vpon the crosse, and

what is
 meant by
 the daily
 Sacrifice
 of the
 Masse.

A Reioindre to

pet a true Sacrifice, because the thing it selfe; to witte, the body and blood of Christe, is no lesse present here, then there, no lesse offered here, then there, though here in Sacramento, in a Sacrament, there in seipso, in him selfe, as S. Augustine speaketh.

Chrysosto. *in Epist. ad Heb. 10.* *The hoste of the crosse, & of the Masse is one.* S. Chrysostome hauing declared S. Paule affirming that Christe offered him selfe once to the destruction of sinne; forthwith saith of the daily Sacrifice offered: *vp by christian Priestes.* Quid ergo nos? Nonne per singulos dies offerimus? &c. Then what do we? Do we not offer daily? yea verely we do so, but that we do, we do it for the remembrance of his death. And this is one hoste, or one Sacrifice, not many. Beholde reader, to thre I speake, for M. Jewels cares can not away with this doctrine. S. Chrysostome saith, the Sacrifice which we offer at the Masse, and that which Christe offered vpon the crosse with suffering death, is one hoste, one Sacrifice, verely the selfe same one body of Christe. The difference that is, is only in the manner of Offering.

Chrysosto. *hom. 2. in 2. ad Tim. 1* That holy Oblation, saith he an other where, whether he be Peter, whether he be Paule, or a priest of what so euer merite, that offereth it, it is the same that Christe him selfe gaue to his disciples, and that Priestes do now consecrate. Why so? Because they are not men that Sanctifie or Consecrate this, but Christe, which before consecrated that. Euen as the wordes, which Christ spake, be the same, that the priestes do also pronounce, so the Oblation is the same. &c. And he that thinketh this to haue ought lesse then that, knoweth not that it is Christe, who now also is present and worketh.

If I thought these Testimonies were not ynough, and sufficient to proue that the Sacrifice of the Masse is a true and Real Sacrifice, forasmuch as we haue the same body of Christe, that was Offered vpon the crosse: I could easily here reherse no
final

final number out of the auncient Fathers, by whom with one consent the body of Christe is avouched to be present in the Sacrifice of the aulter, and in a Sacrament to be Offered by us to God.

But let vs consider the weight both of M. Jewels reason, and of his Testimonies, whereby he would proue, that the Sacrifice of the Crosse is the Daily Sacrifice, so as the Sacrifice of the Masse be not the Daily Sacrifice. For if he would graunt both, which differ not in the thing Offered, but in the manner of Offering, to be the Daily Sacrifice, so the Sacrifice of the Church, which he impugneth be not excluded from that name: in a righe sense I would agree thereto. But his discourse hercof is such, as he seemeth by thaffirmation of one truth to denye an other truth.

As Christe (saith he) is a priest for ever, so doth the same his Sacrifice last for ever. For the vertue of it is infinite, and is neuer consumed.

What conclude you M. Jewel? Ergo that Sacrifice is daily, or the daily Sacrifice? Nay you should rather conclude thus. Ergo it is perpetual or everlasting.

For as Christes Priesthod is everlasting, so is his Sacrifice everlasting. And the thing that lasteth for ever, is not in respect of everlasting continuance properly called quotidian or daily, though what thing is ever, be also Daily. As the Priesthod of Christe is no where called, Daily Priesthod, nor Christe him self, Daily Christe, or the daily sonne of God, but the eternal or everlasting sonne of God. Passe you through other thinges that be everlasting, and you shal not fynde them for their infinite vertue or continuance, properly named daily. Of S. Cyprian this Sacrifice is called *Perpes Sacrificium, & semper permanens holocaustum.* An everlasting Sacrifice.

The thing which is called daily, hath that name in consideration of often renewing, repetition or frequenting.

e h.

As

Difference
between e-
verlasting
and daily.

An eterna-
ling Sa-
crifice.

Cyprian.
de Cana
Domini.

Daily sa-
crifice,
wherof it
is so called

A Reioindre to

As this sacrificing of Christe in the Sacrament is daily repeted and frequented, whereas the sacrifice made vpon the crosse, which Christe made in seipso, in hym selfe, as S. Augustine speaketh, is not iterated, repeted, and done oftentimes. In dede in this Sacrifice of the Church, which is done in Sacramento, it is daily recorde and set forth, and for this, and in this it is daily, because the hoste is one, and no otherwise.

*Aug. de
uerbis do-
mini in Lu-
cam serm.
23.*

*whereof is
the name
of daily sa-
crifice.*

*Daily
bread, dai-
ly sacrifice
daily resur-
rection.*

The wordes that you allege out of S. Augustine, (Tibi hodie Christus est, tibi quotidie resurgit, to thee Christe is to day, to thee Christe daily riseth againe) do signifie, that if worthily you receiue Christ daily in the Sacrament of the aulter, for thereof he speaketh there, then you receiue and enioy daily the benefit of his resurrection. For of the daily receiuing, and repetition of the blessed Sacrament, Christe is said daily to rise againe to vs. So because he is daily offered in the same Sacrament by priestes vnto God, thereof commeth the name of the daily Sacrifice. Of which sacrifice in the same place immediatly before S. Augustine speaketh with these wordes. Thou hearest, that, how oftentimes so euer the sacrifice is offered, the death of our Lorde, the resurrection of our Lorde, the lifting vp of our Lorde is signified, and remission of sinnes, and takest not this daily bread of our life? There haue you mention M. Jewel, which you were loth to see, of the daily sacrifice of our daily bread, of the daily enioying of Christes resurrection. which place serueth vs for proufe of the daily Sacrifice, it serueth not you for proufe, that y^e sacrifice once done vpon the crosse is of the old Fathers called the daily Sacrifice. whereby you labour to abolish the memorie of that sacrifice daily offered in the Sacrament.

Neither maketh any moze for you the place you allege out of the byese Commentaries vpon the Epistles of S. Paul pruned among S. Hieromes woordes, & be not S. Hieromes, which you

you for your aduantage wil here nedes once againe, haue to be
S. Hieromes. For what if it be said by an allusion to the old cu-
 stome of the Hebrewes, that, if we haue no leuen of malice and
 wickednes in vs, (which wordes falsly you suppressed) the lambe
 (who is *Christe* the lambe that taketh away the synnes of the
 worlde) is daily killed to vs, and we celebrate our Easter daily?
 which is true, because then the vertue of *Christes* deatch is effec-
 tual in vs, as contrarywise it is not, if we haue in vs remaining
 the leuen of malice and wickednes. But what conclude you here-
 of, that therfore the Fathers called the sacrifice once done vpon
 the crosse the daily Sacrifice, and not rather the sacrifice, wherein
 a memorie of that sacrifice is daily celebrated with the Oblati-
 on, and participation of the body of *Christe*, as *S. Augustine*
 speaketh?

*In cap. 5. l.
 ad Cor. nō
 in cap. 6.
 vs Iuellus
 notat.*

But seeing you allow these commentaries for *S. Hieromes*,
 we require you to approue the doctrine which you finde contra-
 ry to that you teach, in the sixth chapter which you allege in Stebe
 of the fifth. There your onely faith, for which your felowes
 haue made so much a doo, is accompted insufficient to saluation.
 For this is the saying. *Nolite errare, putantes vobis solam fidem
 sufficere ad salutem, cum omne peccatum permanens, excludat a
 regno.* Be ye not deceiued, thinking onely faith to be sufficient to
 saluation, whereas euery sinne continuing excludeth vs from
 Gods kingdome. By this you may see, your onely faith founde
 insufficient to saluation, and that your faith may stād with synne
 remaining. How much surer and sounder is the doctrine of the
 Catholikes, who teach penance, and workes of charitie to be
 necessarily required to the Iustification of a sinner?

*That on-
 ly faith
 sufficeth
 not to sal-
 uation.*

Your place of *Germanus* a later writer, proueth as the o-
 ther do, the vertue of the Sacrifice made vpon the crosse, to be
 euerlasting, which I denye not. But our spiritual sacrifices of

A Reioindre to

**A foolish
argument
of M.
Jewels
making.**

praises and thankes geuing do proue your assertion very childishly. For what a foolish argument is this? we do daily offer vp vnto God praises & thankes geuing for our redemption: Ergo, the Sacrifice once done vpon the crosse is of the fathers called & daily Sacrifice. So simple is your logike both here & in manner through your whole booke, and yet who scoffeth so much at others mens arguments, as you? May you do not so much scoffe at my argumentes, as at a number of peeuish and childish reasons diuised by your owne merry head, & by you fathered vpon me. But God be thanked, though your malice be great, your power and cunning is smal, in their iudgement, & see you. In dede the simple people you deceiue pitifully. As for the learned, the more they reade your doinges, the more they espie your weakenesse and falshed, and abhorre your whole doctrine.

**M. Jew.
falsifieth
S. Ire-
neus.**

The authoritie that you bring out of S. Irenæus, lib. 4. cap. 34 is utterly to no purpose, being so falsified. For you put in your booke quotidie, in stede of quoque. Looke better to your booke, vfe more truth, we wil looke better to your fingers. You ought to be ashamed to haue alleged that chapter, in which S. Irenæus speaketh so plainly of & veritie and real presence of Christs body in the Eucharist, and of the Sacrifice, which we now treat of.

After this number of authorities alleged to defeat the blessed Sacrifice that we offer vp in the Masse, of the name of the daily Sacrifice: M. Jewel commeth in with one of his phrases, wherof (as I suppose) he hath made him a notebooke: And al to haue in a redinesse, whereby to make some shewe of an answer to any thing alleged in defence of & Catholike doctrine, which he liketh not. That sacrifice (saith he) once offered vpon the crosse is rightly called our daily sacrifice, in like phrase of speech, as is this of Tertullian. We keepe the sabbath not euery seuenth day, but euery day. This he saith, and proueth & not, but he must be belened because of & phrase of Tertullian.

**Tertul. ad-
uersus Iu-
daos.**

Spee, and wil you nedes haue this to be a phrase in Tertullian, to serue your turne against the Sacrifice of the church? what phrase make you of it? *Sabbatum* signifieth in the Hebrew tongue, rest and quiet. The keeping of the sabboth day in y^e olde law, was a figure of our rest from synnes, and fleshy workes. The figure is past, the truth taketh place. Now saith Tertullian, we keepe the sabboth not every seventh day, as the Hebrewes did in the figure, but we keepe it every day, that is to say, we rest fro synnes, and the dead workes of the body, and make every day, as it were holy day. what can you conclude of this phrase? Because Tertullian said so truly, wil you say falsly, that there is now no daily Sacrifice in the Church, wherein the body and bloud of Christe is offered vp vnto the father vnbloudily, but that the Sacrifice which was once made vpon the crosse, is the only daily Sacrifice, and not the same after an other maner daily offered vp of priestes of the new testament? your phrases be to weake. *M. Jew.* for you by the to peruert y^e faith of Christes Church, which hitherto hath continued so many C. yeres, notwithstanding the manifold assaults y^e Satan hath made vnto it, by the violence of tyrannets, and malicious fraude of heretikes.

Least any shift should be omitted, that might seme to haue any shewe or colour against y^e daily Sacrifice, *M. Jewel* toward the ende of this Diuision objecteth, that on good Friday there is no Consecration made: that the Greekes consecrated not in the Lente, but only vpon Saturdayes and Sundayes: that *S. Ambrose* mentioneth twise offering every weeke.

These Obiections may sone be answered. The forbearing of Consecration vpon good Friday, which proceedeth of great reason, letteth not, but that the blessed Sacrifice ought to retaine the name of Daily Sacrifice. For as one swallow maketh not a Springe tide, as Aristotle saith, so neither the intermission of one day, taketh away from this Sacrifice the

M. Jew.
obiections
against the
daily Sa-
crifice.

Sexta synod. ca. 52.

Cōcil. La.

dicō, ca. 49

Ambrosi.

in. 1. ad

Tim. cap. 3.

Vna biru-

do nō facit

ver. In E-

name ibicin.

A Reioindre to

name of Daily, being els every day offered. what if some for deuotion or sickensse do not eate bread vpon some one day in the yere, as many there be that eate nothing vpon that day, is not the foode therfoze, where on they liue, to be called their daily foode?

Ca. 52.

That the Greekes neuer vsed to consecrate in the Lent, but vpon *Saturdayes and Sundayes*, as *St. Iewel* saith, it is moze then euer he founde written. It was decreed in the second Councel of Constantinople, that vpon al other daies of Lent beside *Saturdaies, Sundayes*, and the daye of the Annunciation, a holy Sacrifice should be made of the thinges befoze consecrated, for so be the wordes, *Fiat sacrum præsantificatorum sacrificium*. A certaine manner of Oblation there was of the sacrifice already done and consecrated. Because the other dayes of the Lente were dayes of fasting, wailing, and compunction for their synnes, and to celebrate the vnbloody Oblation, and to offer by the sacrifice vnto God, was as much as to celebrate a feast: in token of their sad penance, the Greeke fathers of that age, forbade Consecration to be made but vpon the formentioned dayes, that so they might the moze be put in mynde of their fasting and mourning. This much in effect we finde reported hercof by *Theodoze Balsamon*. That this was euer the custome of the Greeke church, which *St. Iewel* saith, neither by this councel, neither by the councel of *Laodicea* may it be proued. By *S. Chrysostome* in sundry places the contrary rather appeareth, that the sacrifice was daily offered, for which cause of him, as of the other fathers it is very often called the daily Sacrifice.

But admit, this was a general custome among the Greekes obserued in Lente. At other times they offered the sacrifice daily after the custome of other Churches. And in respect thereof it might iustly haue ben called the daily Sacrifice.

will **M.** Jewel take the worde *Daily* so streightly, that if a thing be left vndone a fewe dayes in respect of the other continual time, it must not be called *Daily*? Saith not Christe in the gospel to them that came out with swoydes and staves to take him, I sate daily among you in the Temple teaching, and ye tooke me not? will **M.** Jewel be so exact in taking this word *daily*, as no day might be excepted? If he be, doth he not charge Christe with a lye for saying, he sate daily in the Temple? For it is certaine by report of the gospel, that oftentimes he was forth of Jerusalem where the Temple stood, at Capernaum, at Hierico, at Bethsaida, at Nazareth, in the coast of Tyre and Sidon, in Samaria, in Galilea, in Decapolis, and in many other places farre distant from the citie of Jerusalem.

When David complained of his enemies, & said of them, they upbraided him daily, saying, vbi est Deus tuus? where is thy God? Must we thinke, that David lyed, and wrote false in his psalme, if some fewe daies he escaped clear without hearing such cursed speech uttered against him? There is no reason why **M.** Jewel should exact such a precisenesse in taking this word *daily*. That may be wel said to be done daily, which is commonly and continually done. **M.** Jewel sheweth him selfe destitute of good mater, when he is dyuyn thus to hunte after wordes. which kinde of trifling vsed of him throughe his whole booke, the learned fathers were wont to cal, *Aucupium verborum*.

S. Ambrose speaketh not of the custome of the whole latine Church, but of his Church of Milan, and of his owne time. For **S.** Augustine who was his scholer, witnesseth this Sacrifice to be daily with these most plaine wordes, which can not be take of the Sacrifice once made vpon the Crosse, but of this which is daily made in a sacrament, wherof we speake. In forme of a seruant he had rather be Sacrifice, then take Sacrifice. Hereby he is also a
 De ciuitate Dei lib.
 10. cap. 20.

A Reioindre to

what is
the daily
Sacrifice
according
to S. Au-
gustine.

priest, him selfe the offerer, him selfe also the Oblation. (Hitherto he meaneth the Oblation once made vpon the crosse. Now he speaketh of our Sacrifice) Cuius rei Sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesie Sacrificium. Of which thing, (to witte of his bloudy Oblation vpon the crosse) he would the daily Sacrifice of the Church to be a Sacrament, whereas of the body it selfe he is the head, and of the head she is the body, and as wel she by him, as he by her is accustomed to be offered.

1. Byre haue you M. Jewel first, y^e Christ in foyme of a seruant, that is to say, as being man, was a Sacrifice, in making which
2. Sacrifice he was both the priest, and the Oblation. Secondly, y^e the Sacrifice of the Church, which is a sacrament of the Oblation y^e was offered vpon the crosse, is the daily Sacrifice, which we treat of, and you deny. which daily Sacrifice can not be vnderstanded of y^e, which was once done vpon the crosse, as you would haue it, because it is a Sacrament thereof, and so is different
3. from that, only in the way and manner of offering. Thirdly, you haue here, that in this Sacrifice the Church is offered vp to God, by Christ, soasmuch as she is the body, and he the head. Fourth-
4. ly, that likewise Christ the head is accustomed to be offered vp to God by the Church, without doubt spiritually by euerie faithful persons deuotion, but Sacramentally by the Ministerie of the Priest, the Churches publike Minister in that behalfe. which power you M. Jewel do denye to be in the priest, both in this, and in your. 17. Article, but how ignorantly and contrary to S. Augustine you deny it, by this it may appeare.

One saying of S. Augustine I can not here let passe, y^e both witnesseth y^e Sacrifice to be daily offered, against which M. Jewel causileth, and sheweth the custome of the Breke Church ratified by decree of the. vi. Council before mentioned, to be particular to that country, (as likewise the testimonie of S. Ambrose is to be vnder-

understanded of his owne church) not general througħ þe whole Church. wytyng to Iannarius he saith thus. Alibi nullus dies intermittitur, quo non offeratur, Alibi Sabbato tatum & dominico, Alibi tantum dominico. One where, there is no day let passe, in which the Sacrifice is not offred. Other where it is offred only vpo the Saturday and Sūday. An otherwhere vpo the Sūday only. Lo M. Jewel, seing that you are so precise in the word *Daily*, I bying you S. Augustine to witnesse on my behalfe, that in some places of Chyristendome no day was intermitted, in which the Sacrifice was not offred. August. epist. 112.

By your owne learning and iudgement I may better allege S. Augustine, who of many is thought to be þe best learned doctor; that ener wote in Chyristes church, and lyued farre within þe terme of your first vi. C. yeres after Chyriste: then you may allege the authoritie of the vi. Councel at Constantinople, which was holden after those yeres, in the time of Iustinianus the Emperour sonne of Constantinus about the yere of our Loyde. vi. C. lxxx. and besides that, seemed to allow the olde Councel of Africa holden in S. Cyprians time, wherein it was decreed that such as were baptized of heretikes, and returned to the Catholike Church, should be baptized againe. which I trow you wil confesse to be erroneous.

Item that Coscel decreed that bishops, after that they were promoted to the order of bishops, should depart and abstaine frō companie of their wyues, which they were married vnto befoze they came to be bishops. Neither that wil you allow (I am sure) for vpright and sounde doctrine. You wil rather I trow, admit a councel, that should licke your bishops, who neuer had wyues of their owne, to take sytters vnder the name of wyues vnto them, and cal it holy wedlocke, which Canon our holy prelates of this new English Church hane founde in your new Gospel, as sundry others of like austeritie, Can. 12.

f u But

A Reioindre to

But if you wil nedes appoyne this Councel, notwithstanding these erreours, and that it was without the compasse of the peres of your owne allowance, that the canon which you allege to proue the Sacrifice of the Church not to be daily, may be take to be of good auctoritie: then how say you to Reseruatiō of the blessed Sacrament in the very canon, which you allege euidently mentioned? For where as the wordes of that Canon be,

Reseruati
on of the
blessed Sa
crament
used in the
Greke
Church.

Ἡ ἐν τῶν προηγιασμένων ἱερὰ λειτουργία, fiat sacrum præla-
ficatorum Sacrificium, Let a holy Sacrifice be made of the
things before Consecrated: what things were they which were
before consecrated vpon the Sunday or Saturday to serue for a
kinde of Sacrifice in the weeke dayes, but onely the body and
bloud of Christ, reserued to be receiued vpon other daies in Lent
beside Saturdaies and Sundaies? Therefore admitting the Ca-
nons of this Councel, you must recante your false doctrine tou-
ching Reseruatiō, which you impugne in your 9. Article.

M. Jew.
allegeth s.
Ambrose,
making al
together a
gainst him
& witness-
ing the sa-
crifice.

And what shal I cal this, impudencie, or great blindnesse
in you, that you allege the place of S. Ambrose? For as it pro-
ueth not the Sacrifice not to haue ben daily, for which purpose
you bring it, but only that in his Church it was at least twise in
the weeke offered, whereby he denyeth not but it might be daily
offered in other Churches, which I shewed before out of S. Au-
gustine: So it geneth an euident witness for the Sacrifice,

M. Jew.
corrupteth
s. Ambrose
with false
translatiō.
Ambros.
iv. 1. ad
Tim. cap. 3.

which you M. Jewel, & they of your sect haue abandoned. His
wordes be plaine, the sense whereof you haue corrupted by your
false translation. For offerre, is not to celebrate the Oblation, as
you turne it, but to offer or to make the Oblation. *Omni hebdo-
mada offerendum est, etiamsi non quotidie peregrinis, incolis
tamen vel bis in hebdomada.* Every weeke we must offer vp
(the Sacrifice) although not euery day for strangers, yet for the
inhabitantes at least twise in the weeke. These wordes haue
you

you thus turned, but how vntrely, I would it to be indged by the learned. *Euery weeke we must celebrate the Oblation, although not euery day vnto strangers, yet for the inhabitantes, yea some times twise in the weeke.*

See Reader the true dealing of this man. whercas S. Ambrose saith, we must offer or do Sacrifice euery weeke for strangers, whereby doubtlesse he meaneth, as al other holy Fathers do, the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Church: to remoue the mynde and vnderstanding of the reader from that sense, because he can not away with that Sacrifice, by his false translation he maketh him to say, we must celebrate y^e Oblation euery weeke vnto strangers. wherby he excludeth vnterly y^e Oblatioⁿ & Sacrifice it selfe, for that can not be done ne offered vnto strangers, but vnto God onely. But he maketh no better thing of it, then that which is to be done not for strangers, but vnto strangers. Now as strangers be not God, so neither is the Sacrifice that S. Ambrose saith must be offered weekly, to be made vnto strangers. The other falshed v^sed in the translation of this sentence, as the diuiding of that which S. Ambrose ioyned together, by making a new point, and the putting in of the word *sometimes*, to euil purpose. I am content to couer with silence. For if I would note al the false partes that M. Jewel hath plaid in his Replie, there should be no ende.

To conclude, I marvel M. Jewel, that your shamesfastnesse suffred you so much as once to touch this place of S. Ambrose, in which he sheweth that Deacons, Priests, and Bishops must not only not mary wines, but also wholly forebeare the companie of a woman, and be purer then the laye people, because they be the agents of God. Verely this doctrine of S. Ambrose squarcth euil with the doctrine of your Gospel, which, as ye of that syde both by word, and practise of life declare, permittech not on-

S. Ambrose
is quite
contrary
to the doc-
trine of
this new
Gospel.

Adores
Dei

A Reioindre to

by your new (what shal I cal them) Ministers of the wordes but also deacons, priestes, and bishops, that by solemne vow haue promised to God the contrary, yea also monkes, frieres, and Nunnes to marrye, and to tame the rebellion of their flesh with satisfying the lustes of their flesh.

The argumentes, which in the ende of this Division M. Jewel disiseth of his owne head, and pretendeth to be made by me, because they be not myne, I do not vouchesafe to answer. I wil not let such a merry head of his pastime. Yet amōg his scoffes he putteth in as poison, many droppes of vntyruth and lying. As (for example.) That, if the vnbloody Sacrifice be necessarily to be frequented, then may it by the priest be done, though he him selfe receiue not.

*Concilium
Toletanū
12. Can. 7.*

This would be proue, because the Sacrifice, and the receiuing be diuerse, as he noteth out of a Councel holden at Toledo in Spaine. In which Councel priestes be expressly forbidden at any time to offer Sacrifice, but when also they receiue. This Councel because it maketh against him in sundry pointes, he reiecteth, synding no greate fault with it here, but that it was a late Councel. And yet was it holden within. lxxx. yeres after his vij. C. yeres, within. v. of. ix. C. yeres past. But because it maketh against M. Jewel, it must be accompted a late Councel, and. ix. C. yeres ago, was but yesterdaye.

Again, that, touching number of communicantes together, though it be no part of Christs Institution, yet neuerthelesse we are bounde to his example, because he hath commaunded vs so to do. which is very false. For Christ commaunded vs not to do so, but to do that, or rather not thus, but this. Doo ye this (saith he) in my remembrance, we are bounde to the thing that Christ did, not to his whole example. For then we should haue. xij. men, and no woman, and obserue many other thinges that Christ did, which we can not do.

For the summe of my words in the .x. Division, & argument deduced of the word Communio, to the denial of Private Masse, is reported to be weake and vnlearned, as that which proceedeth of ignorance. **M.** Jewel, who useth the same for the chief & best of al other, & maketh it very commonly in his Challenge, goeth about to iustifie it: but how directly, and how substantially, I report me to the iudgement of the Learned. In dede much paines he taketh about it, and faine would he make it good, as he that thinketh his estimation therein very much touched. And whereas he noteth me for a mā wel brooking myne owne learning, what so euer he iudgeth of me, it was his parte to haue proued his argument with moze learning, then yet he sheweth.

That the mater appeare plaine to y reader, it shalbe nedeful he peruse both our sayinges: so shal he be hable y better to iudge. Here to reherse the whole, it were to long, and the Replie in this as in other places, is enlarged with much stuffe impertinent.

The point we barpe in, is touching the word Communio. **M.** Jewel, as it appeareth euidently by the Sermon wherein he made his Challenge, thinketh the Sacramēt to haue the name of Communion, in consideration of many receiuers together in one place. Therefore where so euer he findeth Communion mentioned, of the same he deduceth an argument against Private Masse as he calleth it. This is to be sene in his sermon in sundry places, set forth not without insolent insultatio. But because I said, which I say again, y it had this name of an other consideration, and y this argument proceeded of ignorance: therefore he hath made no litle a doo.

Now so farre as I proue the blessed Sacrament to be called Communion, not because many, or as **M.** Jewel saith, y whole Congregation receiuerth together in one place, but in consideration of the effect of it, for y by the same we are ioyned to God, & many that be diuerse be vnited together, and made one body, whether

wherof is
Communis
so called.

In his
Sermon:
fol. 41.

A Reioindre to

they receiue together oꝝ a sundze : so farre I say is M. Jewels argument founde weake and vnlearned.

Dionysius
Ecclesiast.
hier. p. 1. c. 3
Chrysosto.
homil. 24.
in 1. Cor.
cap. 10.

That the Sacrament is so called specially and singularly a-
bout other Sacramentes foꝝ ꝑ effect it woꝝketh in vs, foꝝ pꝛoufe
therof I alleged S. Dionyse the Areopagite. And that it woꝝ-
keth such effect in vs, no man can speake it moꝝe plainly then S.
Chrysostome wꝛiting vpon S. Pauls first Epistle to the Co-
rinthians. And likewise Cyrillus vpon S. Iohn. lib. II. cap. 26.
But let vs heare M. Jewel tel his owne tale.

levvel.

Of the nature of this vvord Communion, I tooke occasion to say, that the
priest ought to communicate vvith the people, foꝝ that othervvise it can
not iustly be called a Communion.

Harding.

what is
meant by
Communi-
on.

And I say, that Communion may be, though the priest receiue not
the Communion together vvith the people in one place, and that
vvhen the people syndeth them selfe not woꝝthy, pꝛoued, and
disposed to receiue, the priest may receiue vvithout the people, as
I haue befoꝝe pꝛoued. The thing ꝑ I denyed was this, ꝑ the Sa-
crament is called Communion because many receiue together in
one place. Foꝝ it is so called chiefly, because al Christians recei-
uing one thing, to witte one body of Christ vnder foꝝme of bread
it woꝝketh vnitie, and maketh vs one vvith Christ, and one vvithin
our selues, so that therby we and Christ be made one body. This
was your part to disproue M. Jew. vvich if you do not, the my
denyal stādeth, & so is not pꝛiuate Masse as you cal it, oꝝ rather ꝑ
priestess pꝛiuate receiuing disproned. But let vs see, how you
pꝛoue Comunion to haue ꝑ name of ꝑ peoples receiuing together
vvith the Priest, oꝝ of that that many receiue together in one place.

levvel.

Here to leaue al contention of learning, and onely to haue regard vnto the
truth, If the very nature of this vvord Comunion, import not a thing to be
pꝛiuate, as it is supposed, much les may it, as I iudge, import a thing to be pꝛiuate.

Harding.

How you leane al contention of learning. & world seeth, what regard you haue onely vnto the truth, let vs examine. The nature of the worde Communio, importeth a thing to be common, I graunte. For through Communion the Body of Christe is made common and one with al that worthily receiue it. But you mistake your wordes Common and Priuate. The Communion is common, not for the receiuing of many together in one place, but for the thing communicated, and imparted to the receiuers, so as it and they be made one thing, whether there be many, fewe, or one in a place. Priuate in this case properly it is not in respect of the thing receiued, nor of the effect, but onely in respect of receiuing. For if a man receiue alone, it may be called single or priuate receiuing in respect of place where he receiuerh, and priuate Communion also, as it is referred to the act of receiuing concerning the place.

How is
the Communion
common.

Priuate
Communion.

Iewel.

It is named Communion, saith M. Harding, of the effect that it worketh in vs, because by the same yve are ioined vnto God, not because many Communicate together in one place. And for proufe hereof he allegeth the authoritie of Dionysius: vtherin he doth great wrong to that good olde Father, alleging his authoritie for the Masse, that neuer spake wordes of the Masse.

Harding.

Is this the truth M. Iewel, that in the next sentence before you promised onely to haue regard vnto? Do I allegē the authoritie of S. Dionysius for the Masse in that place? Or thinke you that S. Dionysius spake not of the Masse, wherreas he wrote of whole order of Liturgie or Masse? Hath he not this? what sticke you so in the name, which the Greeke Fathers haue not? what vnto is this? Yea what folly is it so to
say,

A Reioindre to

Mr. Jew.
promiseth
truth, and
perfor-
meth vne-
truth.

say, specially my wordes being laide before the Reader in your booke, that he may none espie the contrary? Again he how hangeth your owne tale together? for prouise hereof, &c. say you. whereto hath your word hereof relation, but to the effect which the Communion worketh in vs? Immediately you say, vtherin he doth great wrong to that good olde Father, &c. To what referre you, vtherin, but to that is comprised vnder your former word hereof? Then with what reason follow those wordes, alleging his authoritie for the Masse, that neuer spake wordes of the Masse? It seemeth your wittes were troubled with other cares, when ye wrote thus. But when you Communion to haue that name specially of the peoples receiuing with the Priest, or of the receiuing of many together in one place?

Iewel.

It is graunted of al without any contradiction, that one ende of al Sacramentes is to ioigne vs vnto God. &c. An other ende is to ioigne vs al together. &c.

Harding.

What neede many wordes, if it be graunted of al? I alleged S. Dionysie speaking of the effect of the Sacrament, to thintent it might appeare, that thereof it hath the name of Communion, and not onely of many receiuers together. You speake of two endes: but to what purpose? When come you to proue your chiefe point, that the Communion is so called chiefly because many receiue together in one place?

Iewel.

And notwithstanding Dionysius speaketh plainly of both these endes, yet it pleaseth M. Harding in his allegation only to name the one, and * to concele the other: and by the affirmation of the one, vntually to conclude the denial of the other.

Harding.

What soeuer you talke of your two endes **Mr. Jewell**, I reported

The. 76.
vnto truth.
I do not
concele y
other, as
my booke
witnesseth

Ported my allegatiō truly as y^e Doctor wrote it. If I had done otherwise, I perceine your good wil towards me to be such as I had ben like to haue hearde of it. Neither in dede speaketh S. Dionysie in that place expressely of the other ende, for which you make so much a doo. what? would you haue me to adde and put vnto the Doctor of myne owne, more then I finde in the Doctor? That false demeanour we leaue to you, which very often you vse for bad shiftes. If he spake of it in an other place farre distant from that, it was not my durtie to lay it to y^e words that I alleged, & to ioyne y^e together, which I found separate.

But how farre I am from conceling the one of your endes, and from concluding the denyal of the one, by the affirmation of the other, which you lay to my charge: myne owne woordes as they be laide forth in my booke, and as they be put into your booke also of Replie, may witnesse. If such woordes, whereby the ioyning of vs together wrought through the Communion, as one effect of the same is signified, be to be found in my booke: then remaine I cleare of the blame, wherewith you charge me: and you are depheended in a manifest vnt ruth.

For triall hereof I require the Reader, and your selfe also M. Jewell, to peruse the place. There I say thus, Folio, 14. a. lin. 1. The Sacrament is not called Communio, because many or as M. Jewell teacheth, the whole Congregation communicateth together in one place: but because of the effect of the Sacrament, for that by the same we are ioyned to God (Lo there is one effect) and many that be diuerse, be vnitied together, and made one mystical Body of Christe, which is the Church, of which Body by vertue and effect of this holy Sacrament, al the faithfull be members one of an other, and Christe is the head. Lo there is the other effect, or as M. Jewell termeth it, the other of his two endes.

Againe in the same side of that leafe I say thus, after the
g if
allegation

A Reioindre to

allegation of S. Dionysius. By which wordes, and by the whole place of that holy Father, we understand that this Sacrament is specially called the Communion, for the special effect it worketh in vs: which is to ioyne vs nearly to God, so as we be in him, and he in vs, and al we that beleue in him, one Body in Christ. No there is your other ende spoken of againe. Can there any ioyning be nearer, then that we be made together one body, and members one of an other? Yet wil you say, that I concele it, and that by the affirmation of our ioyning with God, I do vntrely conclude the denyal of our ioyning together?

M. Ioh.
speaketh
without
sense or
reason.

But **M. Iewel** if you be not ashamed of your lye, yet how can you cloke your follie? For the one the world wil take you for a Lye. For the other wisemen wil accompt you for a foole. For how foolishly do you speake, how farre beside sense, witte, and reason saying, that in my allegation by the affirmation of our ioyning vnto God, I conclude the denyal of our ioyning together? Be not they which be ioyned vnto God, ioyned also together? In sensible thinges, what two thinges be ioyned in a third, the same be ioyned together: and shal we say, they that be ioyned vnto God, be not also ioyned together? Doth not God knitte, fasten, and binde together al those that be ioyued vnto him? How then can they be sundry and separate? Haue you forgotten the commo principle which you learned in schoole at Oxford, Quaecunque conueniunt in aliquo tertio, & ipsa inter se conueniunt? Whatsoeuer thinges agree together in any third, the same do also agree within them selfe. Wherefore recant that for shame, that by the affirmation of our ioyning vnto God, I conclude the denyal of our ioyning together. But when come you to the point, that it standeth you vpon to proue, that the Communion is so named for that many of the whole congregation doth receiue together in one place?

Iewel.

Iewel.

At touching the later of these two endes, the same Dionysius in the same chapter that M. Harding here allegeth, writeth thus: Sancta ista: unus & eiusdem panis, & poculi Communis & pacifica distributio, unitatem illis diuinam, tanq̃ vnā enutritis prescribit. That holy Communion, and peaceable distribution of one breade, and one cuppe, preacheth vnto them a beaueſly unitie, as being men sedde together. And Pachymeres, the Greeke Paraphrast expounding the same place, hath these wordes, τὸ γὰρ ὁμοῖον ἔστιν &c. For that common diete and consent farther bringeth vs vnto the remembrance of the Lordes Supper. Vwhat so euer M. Harding haue said, I reckē it vvil hereby appeare vnto the indifferēt Reader, that these wordes do sufficiently declare, both the common receiuing of the Sacrament, and also the knitting and ioyning of many together.

Harding.

By your last sentence I perceiue to what purpose you bring al this. to proue common receiuing, and ioyning of many together. That by the worthy receiuing of the blessed Sacrament many, yea so many as do receiue be ioyned together, there was no cause why you should proue it, no man denyed it, and I in my booke in this very place whereupon you make this parte of your Replie, affirmed it most plainely. But when you are not able to proue that is denyed, then your sleight is, craftily to conuey your selfe from speaking thereof, and to shew your copie in a mater, that no man doubteth of. So you seeme to the ignorant to say much, and to proue that you tooke in hand, like a Clerke.

And yet Sir, if I had denyed, that by the Communion men are ioyned together, me thinketh you would proue it very weakely, if you haue no better prouise for it, then this saying of S. Dionysius, and of Pachymeres, which here you haue alleged. For what if the distribution of one bread and one cuppe preach vnto the receiuers, as you english it, or prescribe vnto

g. iiij.

them.

A Reioindre to

them as a lawe which the Greke worde νομοθεσι signifieth, heauenly vnitie? wil it follow thereof, that they be therfore ioyned together? Nay you may argue, that therfore they should be ioyned together. & they be ioyned, these wordes proue not. Neither can you build ought vpon the Greke woorde ἐκοινοῦσθαι, which your Greke friend of Oxford and you, haue turned vnto enutritis. For false translation maketh no good Argument. You should haue turned the woorde thus, Eodem cibo alitis, that is to say, fedde or nourished with one foode, not fedde together as you turne it. The Greke word in that place of S. Dionysius signifieth the vnitie of the foode of diuers received, not vnitie of place in which they should receiue.

To what purpose you alleged the words of Bachymeres, I see not. Merely they proue neyther the ioyning of many together by receiuing the Sacrament, nor that it must alwayes be receiued of a number together in one place. The meaning of it is, that forasmuch as they that receiue worthily eate of one meate, and maintaine mutual loue and con corde among them selues, (for so the two Greke wordes ἐκ κοινῆς ἄρτης and ἐκ κοινῆς ποτηρίου do signifie) Thereby they are euen at this day brought to remembrance of our Lordes Supper. This saying sheweth & the receiuers ought to be in con corde, it proueth not the special ioyning together, which by receiuing the Body of Christe worthily in this Sacrament is caused.

Of like M^r. Jewel wil proue the chiefe point, which is his parte to do, substantially, when he cometh vnto it, that carrieth so long from it. Forgete not Reader, what he hath to proue, that this worde Communio, hath his name not specially of the effect, which is the vnitie of vs vnto God, and of our selues together: but of that that many receiue with the priest together in one place. This much standeth him vpon to proue,

els

M^r. Jew.
helpeth
his cause
with false
translatiō.

In Hieron.
arch.
eccle. part.
1. cap. 3.
¶ 71

what hath
M^r. Jew.
promised
to proue.

els is private Masse as they cal it, no whit disproned. But before he come to his proufes, he mindeth to stuff his Booke, which at first for shew of learning he purposed to make great, with other prolix talke, though to litle purpose. Loth I am thus to spend my time in answering his trifling Obiections. And yet least he should make his vnlerned Disciples beleue, that he were not confuted: I wil leane nothing that semeth to haue any colour of learning or truth vnanswered. The most that I am troubled withal, is his common custome of helping mee, which were easily perceiued, if the Reader would but retourne to my sayinges set forth in his Booke, and marke them wel, after the reading of his Replie. whereof this may be an example.

Jewel.

Now let vs examine this reason. The Communion hath his name of the effect, for that it ioyneth vs vnto God: Ergo *saith M. Harding it signifieth not the Communicating of many together. Surely this Argument is very vweake: I vvil not say, It is vnlerned, or procedeth of Ignorance. He should neede a new Logique, that would assay to make it good.

Harding.

what so euer this Argumente be, learned or vnlerned, surely it is not mine. It procedeth out of M. Jewels owne forge. Many such he forgeth, and yet displayeth the diuise of his owne head. wherein he followeth Children, that oftentimes blame, and chide, and beate the babies which they make them selues of clothes.

I say leaning to the auctoritie of S. Dionysius, that this Sacramente is specially called the Communion for the speciall effecte it woorketh in vs, whiche is to ioynne vs vnto God;

M. Jew. forgeth vaine arguments of his owne, and with the same businesse aduertiseth.

g. iij.

A Reioindre to

God, so as we be in him, and he in vs, and al we that worthily receiue Christ in the Sacrament, be made one body with Christ. What haue you to replie agais̄ this? Jewel: If you haue nothing, leaue your childish Argumēts, soze no more such poppers & vaine toys. Either yeld to the Truth, or leaue to scoffe at the Truth.

Iewel.

Nay it may much better be replied: Vwhat effect can this Sacramēt haue, or vvhom can it ioine to God, but onely such as do receiue it? Or vwhat effect can the Sacrament of baptisme vvorke, but onely in them, that receiue Baptisme?

Harding.

What vaine iangling is this? who euer said, the Sacramentes, as they be Sacramentes, can worke their effect in any other persons, then in them who receiue them? If no man euer said it, wherat shoote you? whom strike you? whom burthen you with suspicion of vnt ruth?

Iewel.

Vwithout al question, the effect that Dionysius meant, standeth not in this, that one man saith a Priuate Masse, and receiue the Sacrament a lone: but in this that the people prayeth, and receiue the holy Communion together, and thereby doth openly testifie, that they be al one in Christ Iesus, and al one amongst them selues.

Harding.

without al question the effect that S. Dionysius meant, what so euer the Deuil and his Ministers meant, is to be gathered of his owne wordes, not of a gainlayers perverting. And his wordes report, as is before said, this blessed Sacrament to worke an vniou and ioyning of vs vnto God, and to gather vs being diuided, and with a diuine folding or wrapping together (Πρὸς τὸ συνιέναι is his word) to bring vs so vnto God,

as we be one with him. which ioyning of vs to God, and of our selues together, is both more largely, and also more plainly set forth by other Fathers, specially by S. Chrysostome. who writing vpon S. Pauls first Epistle to the Corinthians, saith, that We do not communicate together onely in Participatio and receiuing, but in vnitie, or if it were lausful for to speake, in onenesse. For as that Body is vnited vnto Christe, so by this bread in an vnion we are ioyned together. And as (saith he a little after) Bread is brought into one of many graines, so as the graines appeare not, but yet they be graines, ioyned together by vncertaine seuering: so we are ioyned both within our selues one to an other, and also vnto Christe.

Chryso-
stomus ho-
mil. 61. ad
pop. Anti-
ochen. in. 1.
Cor. 10.

This doubtlesse is the effect of the Communion which S. Dionysius meant, and the Fathers haue taught. But in M. Jewels opinion, without al question this effect is the prayer of the people, and their receiuing of the Communion together.

But wrote you what you say M. Jewell, and wherof you affirm? It appeareth by M. Jewels vnflattering talke, that he knoweth not what he speaketh, nor wherof he affirmeth. Is this the effect of the Communion, that the people pray, and receiue the Communion together? As touching the first, if that be the effect, then when two or three communicate, the people prayeth. which is not alwayes true. For many times they be worse occupied, when that is done. For the second, how is the peoples receiuing of the Communion the effect of the Communion? Is the Communion the effect of the Communion? How can any effect be the effect of it selfe? As for example, is my eating the effect of my eating? The effect of my eating, is the sustenance of my body, and is not the effect of my eating. Effect is produced of an action, and is caused thereof. It can not produce, nor cause the same action. A house is the effect of building. For by building a house is made. But how absurd and beside reason is it to say on the other side, that building is

A Reioindre to

the effect of an house, or that an house effectually bringeth forth building? The Childe is the effect of generation: the Childe engendred worketh not that generation. A thing is not the effect of it selfe. what reason is in this? what idle head euer so dreamed? Yet he woulde seeme to proue his dycame by S. Chrysostome. For thus he saith.

Ieruel.

Chrysoſt. And therefore Chrysostome saith, Propterea in Myſterijs alter
ad pop. alterum amplectimur, ut unum multi ſiamus. For that cause in the
Antioche. time of the Myſteries, we embrace one an other, that being many,
hom. 61. we may become one.

Harding.

For auouching chauchozitie of this ſaying, you haue directed the Reader to S. Chrysostome Ad popul. Antiochen. homil. 61. For so we finde the margent of your booke quoted. But there S. Chrysostome hath no such saying. wherefore it resteth that men beleue it to be an auctozitie brought out of your owne forge, from whence you haue sent forth much counterfeite stuffe. And though S. Chrysostom said so, yet it proueth not your purpose. But I marvel when we shal heare your proues, that the Communion is so called, for that many of the whole people receiue it together with the Priest in one place.

Ieruel.

How be it, in plaine speach * it is not the receiuing of the Sacrament, that vwoorketh our ioyning vwith God. For vwho so euer is not ioyned to God before he receiue the Sacramentes, he eateth and drinketh his owne indgement. The Sacramentes be scales and vviuresses, & be not properly the causes of this coniunction. Otherwise our Children that departe this lyfe before they receiue the Communion, and al the godly Fathers of the olde Testament should haue no coniunction vwith God.

The 78.
vntertruth.
for the
worthe
receiving
of the Sa-
crament
worketh
this effect
Rom. 4.

Harding.

Harding.

we be ioyned vnto God two wayes, by charitie and in ver-
ry dede. who so euer is not ioyned vnto God by Charitie, and
presumeth notwithstanding to receiue the blessed Sacrament: he
receiuerh it to his iudgement. But who so euer is ioyned vnto
God by charitie, & receiuerh the Sacrament worthily: the thing
of the Sacrament which is the Body of Christ, so receiued, wor-
kerh his ioyning with God, truely and in dede. And marke
M. Jewel, how plainely this doctrine is taught by S. Chrysos-
tome in the Homilie out of which you sayned your self to allege
a testimonie a litle before. His wordes be these. Vt non tan-
tum per Charitatem hoc fiamus, verum & ipsa re in illam miscea-
mur carnem, hoc per escam efficitur, quam largitus est nobis, vo-
lens ostendere desiderium, quod erga nos habet. That wee be
made this: (that is to say, one body and members of Christes
flesh and of his bones wherof he spake there) not onely by cha-
ritie, but also that by the thing it selfe, we be mingled into that
flesh: this much is done by the meate, which he hath geuen vnto
vs, hauing a desire to shewe the good wil that he beareth to-
wardes vs.

It behoued (saith Cyrillus) that not only the soule should
ascend into blessed life by the holie Ghost, but also that this rude
and earthly bodie should be reduced to immortalitie, by taste,
touch, and eating of that thing that is of couinage with it. wher-
by he meaneth the real eating of Christes precious flesh in the
blessed Sacrament of the altar. Thus by the Sacrament, we
haue a further benefice, and greater coniunction with Christe,
then by Charitie onely.

wheras M. Jewel telleth vs in plaine speech, it is not the
receiuing of the Sacrament that workerh our ioyning with God,
it must by vs be tolde him againe in plaine speache, that
that doctrine is false and heretical. For if the due and worthy

h ij

receiuing

Our ioyn-
ing vnto
God is
two
wayes, by
charitie, &
in dede.
1. Cor. 11.

Chrysostom.
homil. 61.
ad popul.
Antioch.

Cyril in
1. can. lib.
4. cap. 14.
Cognato
sibi gustu,
tactu, cibo

The wor-
thy recei-
uing of the
blessed
Sacra-
ment wor-
kerh our
ioyning
with god.

A Reioindre to

*Cyrrillus
In Ioan.
lib. 11. cap.
22.*

receiuing of the Sacrament worke in vs the sanctification of the sonne of God, then are we ioyned with God. But that is by receiuing the Sacrament wrought in vs: Ergo, thereby we are ioyned with God. The minoz or second proposition wherof the proufe of this doctrine dependeth, is thus proued. Cyrrillus saith, *Ipsū domini corpus coniuncti virtute uerbi sanctificatur, & ad benedictionem mysticam adeo actiuum fit, vt possit sanctificationem suam nobis immittere.* Our Lordes Body it selfe, by vertue of the word ioyned with it is sanctified, and is made so actiue to the Mystical blessing, (whereby is meant the Sacrament) that it may put into vs his owne sanctification.

*The
great be-
nefit of
Christes
flesh wor-
thily recei-
ued in þe sa-
crament.
In Ioan.
lib. 4. c. 12.*

And as the flesh of Christe receiued in the Sacramente putteth into vs the sanctification of the sonne of God, whereby we are ioyned vnto God: so it putteth also into vs lyfe immortall, whereby likewise we be ioyned vnto God. For inasmuch as (saith Cyrrillus) the sonne of God that geueth or maketh life dwelt in flesh, he reformed it vnto his owne good, that is, to lyfe, & being by an vnspeakeable meane of vnion, whole ioined vnto the whole, made the flesh it selfe, quickening or lifemaking: because by nature it is quickening, therefore this flesh quickeneth the partakers or receiuers of it: for it casteth out death from thē, and quite expelleth destruction.

*Lib. 4. in
Ioan. 6. 15.*

He that eateth the flesh of Christe (saith the same Cyrrillus in an other place) hath life euerlasting. For this flesh hath the worde of God, which naturally is life. Therefore he saith: For I wil raise him vp againe in the last day, I, saith he, that is my bodie which shalbe eaten, wil raise him vp againe. How then doth not this Sacrament worke in vs the ioyning of vs vnto God, in which we receiue that flesh, which is lifegruing for the inseparable vnion of the Worde?

And as we are ioyned vnto God spirituallly by faith
and

and charitie, so after the teaching of Cyrillus, by meane of Christes Body receiued in this Sacrament, wee are ioyned vnto Christe corporally or according to the flesh. Disputing with an Arian heretike, who acknowledged that we are ioyned vnto Christe spiritually by faith and charitie, he declareth that we are ioyned vnto him also according to the flesh. His wordes be these. We denie not but that we are ioyned vnto Christe spiritually by right faith and sincere charitie. But that there is no coniunction between vs and him according to the flesh: that truly we deny vtterly, & we say, it is quite beside the Scriptures. Heare Paule saying: that we are al one body in Christe. For although we be many, yet in him we are one. For we do al participate one Breade. Doth he (the Arian heretike he meaneth) perhaps thinke, that we know not the uertue of the Mystical blessing? Which when it is in vs, doth it not cause Christe to dwel in vs also corporally by the receiuing of the flesh of Christe in the Communion? For why be the members of the faithful the members of Christe? Do ye not know faith he, that your members be the members of Christe? Shal I then make the members of Christ the members of an Harlot? God forbid. Our Sauour also faith, He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Bloude, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Wherefore it is to be considered, that Christ is in vs, not by habitude or spiritually onely, which is vnderstanded by Charitie, but also by natural Participation. For as if one mingle molted waxe to other waxe likewise molted, it shal seeme that of both is made one thing: so by receiuing of the Body and Bloud of Christe in the Communion, he is in vs, and we be in him.

Of this Union and coniunction of vs to Christe, and of our selues one to an other, he speaketh also very plainly in his eleuenth booke, vpon S. Iohn, chapter. 18. In that he blesseth

In Iohn.
lib. 10. c. 13.

1. Cor. 10.

The uer-
tue of the
blessed
Sacra-
ment.

1. Cor. 6.

Iohn. 6.

A Reioindre to

(saith he) them that beleue with his owne Bodie through the Mystical Communion, he maketh vs one Bodie both with him selfe, and also betweene our selues. In which place he calleth this vnion made by receiuing Christes Bodie in the Sacramēt, a natural vnion, to exclude the onely spiritual vnion. Of this likewise very much and very plainly speaketh S. Chrysostome vpon S. Paule. 1. Cor. 10. Homil. 24.

As touching that which is said here concerning the Sacramentes, neither be the Sacramentes onely scales, witnesses, markes, tokens, badges, pledges, printes, &c. as M. Jewel And the authoys of the Apologie according to the doctrine of Caluine, do teach: but also they containe grace, and through them grace is geuen. The thing of this Sacrament which we speake of, being the true Bodie of Christe, is not a scale or witness of our coniunction with God, but in dede (if we receiue it worthily) is the cause of our ioyning with God, forasmuch as to it is ioynd the Sonne of God, which consubstantially is life, as Cyrillus saith. And because the actual receiuing of the Sacrament, is not the onely meane and way whereby we may be ioynd vnto God, therfore M. Jewels obiection of his Children, and of the Fathers of the Olde Testament, is void and vaine. But he would faine persnade, that we haue in this blessed Sacrament no better thing, then Manna was, which is both false and blasphemous.

*Lib. 4.
cap. 24.*

whereas vpon occasion of that S. Dionysius wrote concerning this blessed Sacrament, I said in my booke that it is specially and peculiarly called the Communion, for the special effect of it, which is to ioyne vs to God and our selues together, so as with Christe our head we be one body: hereof I inferred that in consideration of this vniuing of vs and ioyning together, we do not communicate alone: but that as the Lambe of

Fol. 14. b.

of

of the olde Lawe was eaten of a companie in one house, so the Church being as S. Cyprian saith, one house, who so euer eateth this our true Lambe worthily, they do Communicate with al other faithful persons of al places that be of this house, and do the like.

Exod. 12.
Sermon
de Cena
Domini.

There I alleged S. Hierome calling S. Augustine a Bpshope of his Communion, prouing thereby them to be of one Communion, and to Communicate together, though they were farre a sunder, and Communion to be, though the Communicantes be not together in one place. which is true, and may right wel be said againe in y same termes: if by the worde Communion, be vnderstanded a Participation or partaking of that which is eueri where one and the selfe same, neither can be diuided by any diuersitie of places or receiners, the Body of Chryste in the Sacrament really contained, and not the bodily receiuing of the formes of Breade and wine. The receiuing of the outward formes (I confesse) is diuerse, but the Communion is one, because it is but one Body that is communicated and imparted. The vnitie or the onenesse of that precious meate, maketh al one that receiue it worthily, and so the Communion is one, though ech Consecration be diuerse from other, though the outward celebration be diuerse, though the receiuing be diuerse in diuerse places. In this respect no Catholike Priest doth Communicate alone, but with other Catholike persons where so euer they be. At his Masse oftentimes for lacke of companie, he receiveth alone touching place, none receiuing with him in the same place. For which y Masse ought not to be called priuate, ne can not at al be priuate, how so euer y receiuing may be called in respect of place, sole or priuate.

Inter epist.
Augustini
epist. 14.

In 4. has
sense is y
Communi-
on one
betwene
diuerse be-
ing asun-
der.

Berear M. Jewel inueryeth, scotterh, spoxteth, spendeth his Diuinitie, Rhetorike, and Sophistrie, maketh ridiculous.

b. iij.

Argu-

A Reioindre to

Argumentes of his owne ridiculous head, reporting them for mine, and doth al that he can deuise, as it were a vice in an Enrterlude to laugh one out of his cote. But when he hath al said, he hath al done. The thing remaineth as before. Al that he goeth about to proue, faileth him, because he woorketh vpon a false grounde, which is, that the woorde Communio signifieth the outward and corporal administration of the Sacrament, in which sense I tooke it not, as I haue declared.

After that he hath sported and taken his pleasure with his owne foolish Argumentes, that no man of any witte or learning would make: at length he commeth to that, he should long before haue proued, or gene ouer: that the Communion hath his name for that many receiue together in one place, or for that (as he saith) the Priest receiueth together with the people:

Iewel.

I wil note one or two and such as M. Harding can not denie but they speake directly to the mater. Pachymeres a Greke vriter, the Paraphrast vpon Dionysius, hath these vvorðes: ταυτην δὲ καὶ κοινὴν λέγουσι, διὰ τὸ τὸν κοινὸν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τῶν μυστηρίων. Therefore (saith he) hath this Father Dionysius called it the Cōmunion, for that then they that were worthy, did communicate of the holy Mysteries. Thus Pachymeres a man of late yeares vvrote vpon the same boke of Dionysius: and wee may safely thinke, he vnderstoode his Authors minde as vvell as M. Harding. He saith Communio is so called of that wee doo Communicate * together. But M. Harding thinketh otherwise, and constantly saith it is not so.

Harding.

The. 79.
vnttruth.
he saith
not toge-
ther.

¶ Few
proueth &
I denied
not, and &
I denied,
he proueth
not at al.

Remember Reader what I denyed, and what M. Jewel hath here to proue. I denyed Communio to haue this name chiefly, not of that many do receiue, but of that many do receiue together in one place, for so be the wordes of my booke. And though M. Jewel crake of those he allegeth for his purpose, and say

say they be such as I can not denie, but they speake directly to the mater: because they touch not the principal point wherein we varie, I must tel him, that his Doctours speake not directly to the mater.

Pachymeres expounding S. Dionysius calling the Sacrament by the name of Synaxis, uttereth the wordes by M. Jewel recited. This Sacrament (saith he) S. Dionysius nameth also Communion, because at that time al that were worthy did communicate of the Mysteries. That they communicated of the Mysteries I graunt: that is to say, that by worthy receiuing of the Sacrament, they were made one body with the body of Christe, flesh of his flesh, bone of his bones, as S. Chrysostome and Cyrillus do most plainly affirme.

Pachymeres in eccl. hierarch. p. 1. cap. 3.

S. Chrysostome hauing alleged those wordes of S. Paule, 1. Cor. 10. The bread which we breake, is it not the Communion of the body of Christe: saith thus: Quare non dixit Mixture? &c. Why said he not partaking? Because he would signifie a certaine greater thing, and shew a great agreing together between these things. For we do not Communicate only in participation and receiuing, but in vnitie or onenesse. For as that body is vaited to Christe, so we also by this bread beioyned together in vnion.

1. Cor. 10. what is meant by Communion.

Againe within a sentence or two. Because many of vs be one bread, and one body: What do I cal (saith he) Communion? We are the selfe same body. What is that bread? (Est, is, hath) greke not significat, as M. Jewel noteth) the body of Christe. And Est, not what are they made, which receiue? The body of Christe. Not significat many, but one body. Thus S. Chrysostome. Of this effect of the Sacrament, that thus we Communicate in vnion, and are made one body with Christe and within our selfe, it hath the name of Communio, and this is that Pachymeres meant.

But that it is called *κοινωνία* in Greke, *Comunio* in Latine, because

A Reioindre to

because many receiued þ̄ Sacramēt together in one place, which was *¶* Jewels part to proue: *¶* Bachymeres mēt no such thing. The contrary as I haue now declared, he semeth to meane in plaine wordes speaking in the same chapter that *¶* Jewel allegeth, of the other worde Synaxis. For this is to be cōsidered, that where as of *¶* S. Dionysius this blessed Sacrament is called by

The blessed sacramēt is called by two names,

Communio

& Synaxis what is meant by Synaxis.

two names, Communio, & Synaxis: *¶* Bachymeres sheweth where of eche name proceedeth. The signification of both tendeth to one ende. And what he saith of Communio before, the like and þ̄ same in effect, he saith afterward of Synaxis. His wordes be these.

Σύναξιν δὲ νοητέον, οὐ τὴν τοῦ λαοῦ, καθὼς τὴν λείψαν τινὸς σήμερον ἐκλαμβάνονται, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς Θεοῦ συναγωγὴν καὶ κοινωνίαν. As much to say, By this worde collection or gathering together, (for so Synaxis one of the names of the Sacrament signifieth) we must vnderstād, not the gathering together of the people, as some now a daies do expounde, but the gathering together and Communion which is to Godward.

To reader *¶* Bachymeres saith in expresse wordes, that the Sacrament is not called Synaxis, which is the same as Communio is, of that the people be gathered together (to receiue with the Priest as *¶* Jewel teacheth) but of that they are gathered together and made one with God, because they are compact and gathered together into one body with Christe by worthy receiuing of this Sacrament. we may safely thinke he vnderstode his authours mynde as wel as *¶* Jewel. He saith, as some now a daies do expounde, of which number *¶* Jewel is one at this time. And so he is expresse confuted by *¶* Bachymeres his owne Doctor. Thus by *¶* Bachymeres, as the Sacrament is called Synaxis, not because þ̄ receiuers are gathered together to receiue in one place, but because they are gathered to God, & in him ioyned together: so by his interpretation & meaning, it is called *κοινωνία* þ̄ is Communio, chiefly, because throught the blessed Sacrament &

One thing is ment by Synaxis & Communio.

the

the participation of the Mysteries, we are made one body with Christ, & consequently one wth God. Now as to be made one with God, whereas before we were diuerse & sundry from God, & to be gathered to God, is one thing: so is Communio and Synaxis one thing, though diuerse names. Therfore as Synaxis is so called of γ we be gathered together to God, not of the peoples gathering together into one place: so is Cōmunio likewise, of γ we are by the Sacramēt made one with God, and ioyned together in God. Which is that I said, and is not disproued, but rather wel approued by Pachymeres, whom M. Jewel allegeth.

But what if I graunt, the Cōmunion to haue that name, for γ the worthy do communicate of γ mysteries in the sense γ M. Jewel can iustly cōclude of Pachymeres wordes? It is called Cōmunio because many did communicate. What the? Ergo together? I graunt together spiritually, as S. Dionysius & Pachymeres ment, γ so they be made one body wth Christ, & within them self brought together into one body, & into one with God, but yet not into one place. Of every priest γ saith Masse the blessed Sacramēt is receiued, & so he communiceth of the flesh of Christ, & is made one body wth al those γ worthily receiue any where els, and doth not communicate alone, though in respect of γ place he is in, he receiue γ outward formes alone. That it be a Cōmunion, it is ynough the Sacrament be worthily receiued. And who so euer doth so receiue, though he receiue alone concerning the place, yet he doth Communicate with al others doing the same. For thereby al are ioyned together and made one body, be their outward persons neuer so farre a sunder. And so in the Primitive Church the faithful receiued the Communion daily, yet very seldome together in their Publike assemblies, but most commonly at home Primarily in their houses, for feare of the Infidels, of whom they were persecuted.

M. Jewel proueth no moze but that the Communion was receiued, which no man denieth,

who so euer receiue the sacrament alone worthily, doth communicate with al others doing the like, though when they receiue, they be a sunder.

A Reioindre to

The point and that it were wel done to receiue it altogether, or in compa-
that M. nies, it is not denyed. But that of necessitie it be alwayes recei-
Jewel ued of a companie together in one place, or els not at al: that is
ought to denyed, and that is the point which M. Jewel hath to proue,
proue. and yet through his great booke hath not proued, nor shal neuer
 be able duly to proue. For lacke of proufe of this point, al is void
 what so euer he bringeth against the Masse, which he calleth
 private.

This being so, the more euident is your lye M. Jewel, that
 you make vpon Bachymeres, where you say thus. He saith Com-
 munion is so called of that we do Communicate together. For he saith not
 so, the word together, is of your owne putting in more then you
 founde in your Doctor. That we who are Priestes, are bound to
 communicate when so euer we celebrate the vnbloody Sacrifice
 of the Church, we graunt, and so we do: but that we must of ne-
 cessitie do it with al the people, or with a number together in the
 same place: that we deny vtterly, and vntill you proue it, we shal
 require you to subscribe according to your promise. Now that
 Bachymeres serueth not your turne, let vs see what auncient
 Fathers you haue.

Iewel.

In 1. Co. 10. Haimo vriting vpon S. Pauls Epistles saith thus, Calix appellatur
 Communicatio, quasi participatio, quia omnes Communicant ex
 illo. The cuppe is called the Communication, which is as much as Partici-
 pation, because al do Communicate of it.

In speculo Hugo Cardinalis saith thus: Posthoc dicatur Communio, quæ
ecclesia. appellatur, vt omnes communicemus. Afterward let the Communion
 be said, which is so called, that we should al Communicate. And he saith
 further. Vel dicatur Communio, quia in primitiua ecclesia popu-
 lus communicabat quolibet die. Otherwise (saith he) it is called the
 Communion, for that the people in the Primitiue Church did Communicate
 euery day.

Harding.

Harding.

It is an evident token your matter is euill, that you haue not one auncient Father on your syde. For those which you allege be farre without the compasse of the first six hundred yeres after Christe. Daimo maketh no more for you, the Pachymeres doth. For what if the cuppe be called Communication, because al Communicate of it, as peraduenture in Daimos time, and in the cōsuetrie where he lyued, the people receiued the blood of our Lorde in forme of wine: wil it therof folow, that Communion is so called specially for that many receiue together in one place, and not rather because through the Sacrament they are made one body with Christ? And who so euer doth Communicate of Christes body, is he not also made partaker of his blood?

But in alleging Daimo, why did you not reherse his wordes wholly, as you founde them? The cuppe of Daimo is called Calix benedictionis, qui benedicitur a sacerdotibus in altari, the cup of blessing, which is blessed or consecrated of priestes at the Altar. Was that soppe to hote for you? what is that you mistaketh, the Consecration, or the blessing, the Priestes, or the Altar, or the blessing at the Altar, or altogether? This was your wisdom, where you impugne the Masse, to cut awaye al wordes, that may make for the Masse. Merely therein you do but your kinde. Al of your professiō haue euer vsed the like falshed. wherin the fauourers of your sect, must beare with you, as doubtlesse they do, or require you to hold your peace. For how can vnt ruth be bolstered, but by vnt ruth.

And Sye, seing y you were not ashamed to allege Daimo for you, though in dede to no purpose: it is reason you admitte his authoritie as good and lawfull. With euen dealing you can not take his witness in one thing, and refuse it in an other. How say you then to the real presence by him most plainly auouched

Sh. Jew. hath not one auncient father for proufe of his assertion.

Daimo falsified of Sh. Jew. by leauing out wordes of great importance.

Daimo maketh wholly against Sh. Jewels doctrine touching the real presence, & transubstantiation.

A Reioindre to

1. Cor. 10 in these wordes? Caro quam verbum dei patris assumpsit in vtero virginali, in vnitae suae personae, & panis qui cōsecratur in ecclesia, vñ corpus Christi sunt. Sicut enim illa caro corpus est Christi, ita iste panis transit in corpus Christi, nec sunt duo corpora, sed vñ corpus, The flesh which the word of God the Father toke in the virgins wombe in vnitie of his person, & the bread which is cōsecrated in the Church, are one body of Christ. For as that flesh is the body of Christe, so this bread goeth into the body of Christe; neither be they two bodies, but one body.

If I had alleged this place for the Real presence, and for Transubstantion, you would haue founde fault with his age, and would haue said, he had ben out of your compasse. Now that you allow him, we require you to yelde and subscribe to the Real presence, and to the breades going into the body of Christe, which is a Transubstantiation. Yelde you wil not, yet answer you can not.

Hugo Cardinalis
is alleged
by Mr. Jewel, is
a late wyrtter.

Hugo Cardinalis a late wyrtter, who liued about thre hundred yeres past, in these wordes saith nothing that proueth the Communion so to be called, because the Communicantes receiue the Sacrament together in one place. Let it be, as he would haue it, if the wordes be truly alleged, that it is called Communio, that al we should communicate: yet it is not necessary that al come together into one place to Communicate, neither that there be no Communion at al, except al in a parish, or at least a good number receiue together.

were not Mr. Jewel giuen to narrow shifts, he would not cal Hugo Cardinalis to helpe him. For it is wel known, that if he committe his cause to his arbitrement, he is condemned. If he permitte vs to vse the testimonies of the later wyrtters, as he blith them him selfe for his aduantage very ofte: he were sone oppressed both with number, and also with weight of testi-

testimonies, condemning every parte of his doctrine, wherein he
varied from the Catholike Church. But iudge Reader whether
this be even dealing or no. **Jewel** admitteth no authoritie
alleged by vs out of any wyter, that lyued after the first. vi. C.
yeres after Chyiste. Yet he him selfe boldly vseth to bolster vp
his new doctrine by late wyters, by Schoole men, who in dede
he bitterly condemneth, and by who so ever seemeth to say ought
founding to the sense he would bring the world vnto. Yea he
will not let to allege the very objections of the Schoolemen dis-
sembling their answer, which objections they make in their
disputations against the truth, to thintent by assailing the same,
the strength of truth might appeare the better: as though they
were in earnest, and of purpose wrytten of them in defence of
the truth.

The bne-
ne dealing
of M. Jew-
ell.
M. Jew.
bindeth vs
for proufe
of the Ca-
tholike doc-
trin to the
Fathers
of the first
vi. c. yeres
and he him
selfe vseth
for his
help, the
wyters of
all ages.

After **Dachymeres**, **Basimo**, and **Hugo Cardinalis**, he alle-
geth one **Berardus Lopezius**, and **Georgius Cassander** byin-
ging in with him an obscure booke named **Micrologus**, men of
our time, and in many pointes addicted vnto them that haue di-
uided them selues from the Catholike Church. whose doctrine
is condemned by the Church, and therfore we admit not their
authoritie, nor esteeme it no better, then the authoritie of **Peter**
Martyr, **Caluine**, **Tranmare**, **Frier Louerdal**, **Frier Bale**,
Monke Hooper, or any other the like Apostates doctours of
this newe founde Gospel.

The so.
vntruth.
It is no
decree, nor
canon Ec-
clesiastical
Exercita.
ad pietat.
serm. 4.

S. Basile reporteth an Ecclesiastical Decree or canon, that at the receiuing
of the holy Communion, which he calleth mysticum Pascha, there ought to
be twelue personnes at the least, and neuer vnder.

Harding.

This is false, as the rest before is. There was neuer any such
ecclesiastical Decree or Canon made. Neither doth **S. Basile**
reporteth
t. iiij. repozte falsly.

M. Jew.
reporteth
S. Basile
woorden
falsly.

A Reioindre to

The place
of S. Ba-
sil decla-
red.
 repoyte the necessitie of twelue persons at euery Communion,
 for that were absurde, and your selfe M. Jewel do not allow it,
 I am sure. S. Basile onely proponeth the example of the num-
 ber, which it pleased the holy Ghost to be present at Chyistes last
 supper, where the mystical Lambe after the typical or figuratiue
 Lambe of the olde lawe was first eaten: By that example requi-
 ring the Monkes of his Institution not to liue solitarily, but
 ten together at least. Neither repoyteth he by way of an ecclesia-
 stical Decree or Canon, what the holy ghost would for time to
 come to be obserued in the Communion touching the number
 of them that should receiue together in one place: but what he
 would to be done at the first Institution of the Communion,
 where their presence was requisite, who then were to be instruc-
 ted, how to do the same, & to deliuer it to the Church afterward.
 More thereof for number of Communicantes together in one
 place, can you not conclude. Abuse not the simplicitie of the un-
 learned reader M. Jewel; whom for lacke of knowledge it is ea-
 sy to deceiue, specially for him that by outward shewe of such cal-
 ling hath gotten him selfe some credite.

The. xi. Diuision.

The effect
of my
wordes in
M. Jew-
els. xi. Di-
uision.
In the
Answer.
fol. 14. b.
My wordes placed by M. Jewel in his. xi. Diuision, per-
 teine to that goeth before. By diuiding them a sundre,
 he would haue them seme to containe a newe mater di-
 uerse from that was treated before. In that place I say, there
 may be a Communion, though the Communicantes be not to-
 gether in one place: which be my wordes immediatly before the
 first sentence of this diuision. There I demaunde a question:
 whether, if a Priest after his dyner deliuer the blessed Sacra-
ment

trament to. itij. or. v. sicke persons in sundry houses, requiring to receive their rights befoze they depart this life, when no other person is ready to receive with them: he do not communicate with them hauing receiued at his Masse that day, and whether they do not communicate together, though they be not together in one place. If this be not a Communion, and if so to do it be utterly vnlawful for lacke of a number to receive with ech of the in the same place: then should the sicke be defrauded of their visage prouision, which were a cruel iniurie, and whereas by sundry olde canons they that were excommunicate were admitted to receive their rights befoze their departure, it were beside reason other christian folke, who had not deserved the like punishment, at their ende to be denied that necessarie vitale of life. If then this be admitted for a good and lawful Communion, why is not that which the priest receiveth at his Masse likewise a Communion, specially why shal we not say, he doth Communicate with others doing likewise, though not in one place? This is the effect of my wordes there.

To this M. Jewel replieth with mo scoffes, then learned reasons, and turning away from the principal question, he speaketh most of things by me not mentioned. And to haue the better occasion to make sport with argumentes of his owne forgerie, he surmiseth that al this was said for prouise of priuate Masse directly, whereas I speake it onely to this ende, to declare that communion is among them, who be in places distāt, as by view of my booke the reader may iudge. And when he hath altered the state of the question, and bozne his reader in hande, that I say, as he would haue me say for his better aduantage to replie: then he triumpheth and maketh gay spozte at me, as though his minde were to make a fitte of mirth for Whentiles, rather then to satisfie the expectation of the grane reader. Among his

scoffes

A Reioindre to

scottes he minglith certaine vutritches worthy to be noted, as
foz example.

Iewel.

The. 81. If the priest not vwithstanding his diner, communicate vwith the sicke, then
vutritch. hath M. Harding yet founde no priuate Masse. And it appeareth by S. Au-
It appea- gustine and certaine olde Canons, that in the primitive church both the
reth not. priest and people sometimes communicated together after supper.
Cöcil. Car

Harding.

thag. 3. c. 6

Augustin.

ad lanua.

epist. 118.

Q. Ieso.
manifestly
falsifieth
S. Augu-
stine, and
faineth old
Canons.

whether the priest after his diner receiue the Sacrament with a
sicke mā oꝝ receiue not, therein consisteth not priuate Masse. And
what if it appeare by S. Augustine, that certaine were delited
with a probable reason (as he saith) that the body and blond of
our Lord might be offred and receiued after other meates, as foz
a moze notable Commemoration vpon one certaine day in the
yere, in which our Lord gaue his Supper? And this is al that he
saith touching that mater. wil you hceof conclude as though it
were so at other times vled? Merely you can not. why then do
you falsifie S. Augustine, & faine certaine olde Canons, as men-
tioning that the priest and people sometimes communicated to-
gether after supper? He y saith sometimes, meaneth he not moze
then one certaine day in the yere? And what olde Canons cā you
allege foz it? what Canons you haue, it appeareth ful wel by that
you haue noted in your booke margent, wher you referte your
reader to the third Councel of Carthage, Can. 6. And there is no
worde of any such thing. In the 19. Canon of that councei speci-
al charge is geuen, that the Sacraments of the anltar be not cele-
brated but of men that be fasting, except Maundie Thursdaye.

But what pleasure had you thus to saye? O; why said you
this much, but to bring the blessed Sacrament in contempt by
perswading the people; it might as wel be receiued after diner
and supper, as before when they be fasting? Saith not S. Augu-
stine in that very Epistle to Ianuarius the contrary? That the

Sa-

Sacramēt is through y^e whole Church alwayes taken of them y^e be fasting? That it hath pleased the holy ghost, that for the honor of so high a Sacrament our Lordes body shuld enter into the mouth of a Christian before external meates? That this custome is kept throug^h y^e whole world? And that although Christ gaue it after supper for great cause, yet now it ought not so to be?

*Augustin.
ad Ianua.
epist. 112.*

Iewel.

And why is this prouision thought so necessary? Or why is it counted so cruel an iniurie, if the sick man passe without it? Shal no man be saued that so departeth? In dede that were a cruel iniurie. Infinite numbers of childre and others depart this life in goddes mercie without that vitale.

Harding.

The Sacramental eating of this heavenly foode, is not to euery one absolutely and simply necessary, so as without it there be no hope of saluation besides. The benefite of it, if it be worthily receined, is so great, as no other thing can seme to profite vs moze, specially if it be receined at our departure hence. For wheras the thing which we receiue is y^e body whereunto the woide is ioyned, which by nature is life, and thereby that body is made Viuifical, quickening, or lifemaking: how can it be thought, but that it is an incalculable benefite, when death approacheth, a man to be made partaker of life, and to receiue that whereby death (as Cy- rillus oftentimes saith) is dynen away, & quite expelled fro vs?

The benefite of the blessed Sacrament worthily receined.

Viuifcum

*In Iohann.
lib. 4. &
lib. 10. &
lib. 11.*

This great profite *S. Basile* commendeth very much, calling it the participation of life. To communicate euery day (saith he) and to receiue the holy body and bloud of Christ, it is a goodly mater, and a thing very profitable, as he saith him selfe: he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud, hath life euerlastig. *Quis enim ambigit, quin frequens vitæ participatio, nihil aliud sit, quàm pluribus modis viuere?* For who doubteth, but that the often participation of life, is nothing els, but a man to liue by many waies?

*In epist. ad
Cæsariam
patritiam
qua græcè
extat.*

*Ioan. 6.
S. Basile
communica-
ted foure
times in 8
weeks.*

A Reioindre to

we therefore do communicate sometimes euery weeke, the Sunday, Wenesday, Fryday and Saturday, and other dayes also, if there happen a memorie of any Sainct.

Hereof we finde a notable testimonie in *S. Chrysostome de Sacerdotio*, lib. 6. which I trust *M. Jewel* wil not least at, as he doth at the like visions of holy mē, for the graue auctorities sake of *S. Chrysostome*. *Quidam mihi narrauit. &c.* One tolde me (saith he) who was not tolde it of an other, but was accompted worthy, both to haue sene it him selfe, and to haue heard it: that they who depart out of this life, if they be partakers of those mysteries with a pure and cleane conscience. when they be at the point to yelde vp the ghost, are carried away from hence streight into heauen by Angels beset about their bodies in manner of a garde. For these causes to denye a man his rights at his end, I might wel cal it a cruel iniurie.

*Chrysosto.
lib. 6. de Sa
cerdotio.*

*De conse-
crat. dist. 2
Presbyter
Euchari-
stiam.*

*The ne-
cessitie of
houseling
in time of
sickness.*

*Cyprian.
lib. 1. epi. 2.*

Concerning necessitie, it is in a certaine degree necessary, for that the Church of Christ hath ordeined, that sicke persons be not denied their viage pponision. Again, because it is a cruel iniurie, that any mans good affection and deuotion in that case, & at that time should be denied: necessary it is that such a deuoute request be satisfied. who wil not say, it is necessary euery christen person at his departure hence, be fensed against the common ennemie of mankinde? Of al thinges what can be a better fense against our mortal ennemie the deuil, & against euerlasting death it selfe, then the body of Christ, which conquered the deuil, & being vnited to the worde is by nature viuifical, quickening, & life geuing, and therfore dyueth away the death, and procureth life for euer, of whom so euer it is worthily receined? The Eucharist (saith *S. Cyprian*) is made to this ende, that it may be a safegard vnto them that receiue it: whom we wil to be safe against the ennemie, the we arme with the armour of our Lordes fulnesse, Dominice

minica saturitatis, that is to say, of our Lodes body in þ blessed Sacramēt, wherō their spiritual stomake is filled & refreshed.

In cōsideration of this great benefite the Fathers euer moued the sicke persons herēvnto. Refuse not my sonne (saith S. Augustine) to receiue that body of our Lorde which supplieth life: yea rather see that thou seeke for it most greedily, and eate it faithfully. That incomparable and vnspeakeable meate shalbe vnto thee a most holesom wayfare or viage prouision, and price of thy redemption.

Iewel.

In the primitiue church, this order vvas thought expedient, * not for the sicke, for they in their health receiued * daily, and in their sicknesse had the Sacrament ordinarily sent home vnto them: but for persones excommunicate, and enioyned to penance.

Harding.

What say you M. Jewel? was it thought by the Fathers of the Primitiue Church þ this heauenly vitaille was expedient for the excommunicate persons only, & not for þ sick? sothly it was thought expedient for both, albeir þ excommunicate persons were not permitted to receiue but at their end, onles they had besofe ended their penāce enioyned, & had ben absouled, & al others might receiue, whēsoener they required þ same. And how foolish a thing is þ you say, the Sacramēt was thought expedient not for the sick, but for the excommunicate persons in the primitiue church? for (say you) the sicke in their health receiued daily. If they receiued in their health, then were they not sicke. But to leaue that to some excuse, If they receiued it daily in health, why should they not receiue it in sicknesse, being accordingly disposed? was it profitable in health, yea being daily receiued, and not profitable in sicknesse, and at the departing out of this life? woul you haue a man receiue life when he is hole, and to be destitute of life, when he is sicke? Woul he not rather at that time most nede of life?

And how standeth this together, the Sacrament was not thought:

August. de
visitatione
infirmorum.
lib. 2.

The. 81.
vnto truth.
The. 83.
vnto truth.
August. de
Serm domini in
te. cap. 12.
Iustin.
martyr.
M. Jew.
tale han-
geth not
together.

A Reioindre to

Ad. Few thought expedient for the sicke, & yet in their sicknesse they had it
 fighteth a- gainst him
 selfe with
 cōtradice-
 tion.
 ordinarily sent home vnto them? If it were ordinarily sent home
 vnto them, then was it thought expedient. For had it not ben
 thought expedient, then to haue sent it vnto them, it had ben su-
 perfluous. The ordinary sending argueth, that it was thought
 expedient as wel for them, as for the Excommunicate persons.
 For what was done moze for the excommunicate, concerning
 the Sacrament, but that it was sent vnto them being at point
 of death? If the sending of it to both were equal, why was it
 thought expedient for the one, and not for the other? How han-
 geth your tale together?

Can. 13

Were let vs cōsider how many vnturthes you haue vetered in
 one short sentēce. That the Sacramēt was not in the Primitive
 Church thought expedient for the sick, it is vnttrue. For the Fathers
 of the Nicene Councel geue great charge to Bishops, to deliuer
 the Communiō to al them that depart out of this life. For the sick,
 & for the pilgrimes & strāgers it was kept in readinesse alwaies
 as it appeareth by sundry histories. That the sicke in their health
 receiued daily, for so you say, if you meane it of the East church, it
 is also vnttrue. For S. Chrysostome complaineth vehemently of
 the peoples negligēce & slacknesse in that behalfe. S. Ambrose
 likewise noteth a great slacknes in the people of the East church,
 for that they had a custome to receiue but once in the yere. S. Au-
 gustine in his Epistle to Ianuarins reporteth, that some cōmu-
 nicated of the body and bloud of our Lord euery day, some recei-
 ued but certaine daies. And in the place it selfe which you allege
 here for you, he saith, plurimi in orientalibus partibus non quoti-
 die cœnæ dominicæ comunicāt, very many of the East partes
 do not communicate of our Lordes supper daily.

Chrysosto.
 homil. 61.
 ad popul.
 Antiochē.
 Ambrosi.
 de sacra-
 mentis. lib.
 5. cap. 4.
 August.
 epist. 118.
 August. de
 sermone
 Domini in
 monte lib.
 2. cap. 12.

And whereas he saith there of the Sacrament, quotidie ac-
 cipimus, we receiue daily, he meant indefinitely of Christs folke,
 among whom some euery day receiued in one place or other. But
 that

that al receiued Daily that were in helth, or that any certain and determinate persons receiued daily, that S. Augustine saith not. Therefore you alleged S. Augustine vntuly for daily receiuing of the Sacrament.

That you allege S. Iustinus for the sending of the Sacramēt ordinarily home to the houses of sicke persons, it is also vntuly done, for in the place of his second Apologie, he speaketh neuer a word of any sicke persons, but only of such as remained at home.

Iustinus in
2. Apolo.

At last (the geuing of the viage prouision) grevy to such superstition, that it was thrust into mennes mouthes, after they were dead, as we may see by the Council of Carthage forbidding the same.

Levvel.

Harding.
Seldom say you truth M. Jewel. where finde you the blessed Sacrament was thrust into mennes mouthes after they were dead? That it was geue to the bodies of some that were dead, it appeareth by the vi. Canon of the third Council of Carthage forbidding the same, which you allege, but that it was thrust into their mouthes, you say it, for more contempt of the Sacramēt, but without witness, without prouise, and vntuly you say it. So you say in your challeging sermon with like libertie of lying, and with like wickednes of desire to bring that holy Mysterie into further contempt, that S. Benet ministred it vnto a dead woman.

The 84.
vntuly.
The 85.
vntuly.
It is not
so to be
sene.
The Sa-
crament
was geue
to the bo-
dies of
some that
were dead
not thrust
into their
mouthes.
A notori-
ous lye,
made by
M. Jew.
vpon S.
Benet.

All which be vaine lyes. And no such thing was euer reported by any graue authour to haue ben donne by any Saint. In dede S. Gregorie writeth that S. Benet gaue with his owne hand a singling cake (as we cal it) to be consecrated, & so to be offered in sacrifice at Masse for two noble religious women, to the intent they might be reconciled & absolued, who after their death by Gods secret disposition were permitted to shewe, that they remained in state of excommunication, with which S. Benet had threatened the being a lyar, onlesse they would amend certaine faultes they had committed, which they amended not.

Dialogorū
lib. 2. cap.
24.

A Reioindre to

Dialog.
lib. 2. cap.
24.

He writeth also that the same S. Benet caused the Sacramēt to be laid vpon the breast of a Ladde, whose dead body rested not in the graue it was buried in, but sundry times was cast forth againe, vntill that was done by S. Benetes commaundement. Now as if others had presumed to do ſ like, it had ben an abuse, and therefore the thing being grown vnto an abuse, it was forbidden by the third Councel of Carthage: so forasmuch as it was done of so holy a man as S. Benet was, and good thereof proceeded: it is rather to be wondered at, and God to be praised for it, (who by special dispensation of his mercie worketh such grace by men) then to be reprobued, scorned, & mocked. But al this is besides our purpose. why come you not to the question? Jewell? why bestow you so many wordes in a mater impertinent, and touch not the special point, that here is of you demanded?

Iewel.

But let vs graunt M. Harding his vvhole request: Let his priest come and minister to the sick.

Harding.

Sir I make no request nor sute vnto you. Only for further declaration of ſ I said befoze, I demaund a question, where vnto you are loth to make direct answer I perceiue. My question is known, and set forth befoze, thereto what answer you? whē the priest after he hath said Masse and dined, geueth the Sacrament to certaine sicke persons at the point of death in sundry houses without other companie to receiue with ech one, is it a lawful Communion or no? Woth the priest and they communicate together or no? If such communion be vnlawful for lack of others to communicate in the same place, then shal the sick be defrauded of that necessary vitale of life through others default, which is not reason, and great iniurie it were to denie that benefite to any Christian person at his departure, that requireth it, and contrary to Decrees of holy Councils.

Neither

Neither is the Priest in that case bound to kepe him selfe fasting to receiue at al callinges with a sicke man, nor after common meates being in helth may he receiue, for al these are forbidden by decrees of auncient Councels. If this be a lausful Communion, notwithstanding theire being aparte in sundry places: why is not that also a lausful Communion, which the Priest frequenteth at his Masse, hauing no company disposed to receiue with him in the same place?

Jewel.

What maketh al this for his Priuate Masse? The members of these Arguments hang together like a sicke mans dreame, not one piece like an other. For if there be a Masse, vvhich of the two is it, that saith this Masse? Is it the sicke man or the Priest? The Priest hath dined, and therefore may not: the sicke man is no Priest, and therefore can not. Here * would M. Harding saine finde a Masse: but he can find no man to say his Masse, and so hath hitherto found no masse at al. And thinketh he to proue his Masse by the thing that is no Masse?

Harding.

What this maketh for priuate Masse, you see. Albeit I said not this, therby to proue priuate Masse directly, but by way of a question to declare that priuate or sole receiuing is not vnlawful, for which your fellows and you speake much vilanie against the Masse. And this is said to thintent that if Communion receiued by one alone be not vnlawful, the Masse wherat the Priest receiueth alone, for which cause ye cal it priuate, be no moze impugned, as for that respect vnlawful.

But what meant you to find so great fault to my arguments: which be the Arguments that you reprove? Or made I in this place any arguments at al? Merely I made none. Yet you beare your Readers in hand I do, & you may take occasion to say your pleasure. And this is your common custome through your whole booke, to go from the point that is specially treated, to

The. 86.
vnttruth.
I make
no argu-
ments in
this place.
The. 87.
vnttruth-
here I
seeke not
for the
Masse.

A Reioindre th

Mr. Jew. by things, and to scoffe at your owne fained Arguments, pretending them to be mine. wherewith you please your Disciples and other good fellowes perhappes, whose lippes like wel such Letise: wise and learned men I am sure you please not, and time shal trie your Replie, to be but a smoother, that geueth no light, and casteth no heate. Now Syr touching your long scoffing tale, if I tel you, that when a sicke man receiveth his rites alone at a Priestes hande, as the manner is in the Catholike Church, there is no Masse: what haue you to say? This being tolde you, your gape spoyle wherof you are full in this Division, is altogether disgraced.

Iewel:

Againe, graunt vve this action of the Priest not onely to be a Priuate Masse, but also the necessitie of the sicke considered, to be lausful. Yet could not this president make it lausful to be done openly in the Church, whereas is no such case of necessitie. The circumstances of place, of time, of cause, of ende, of manner of doing be not like.

Harding.

This action of the Priest is not onely lausful, but also due, whether it please you to graunt it or no. But if you graunt it to be a Priuate Masse, it is more then I require, and more then truth acknowlegeth. But you speake of a case of necessitie, as though it were lausful onely in consideration of the sicke mannes necessitie, not otherwise. what **Mr. Jewel** haue you so sodainely forgotten your selfe? Is that now become necessarie, which euen now you said, was not necessarie? Go backe againe a fewe lines, and reade your owne wordes in this verpe Division, reporting the blessed

Mr. Jew.
within
fewe lines
gainesayth
him selfe,
by a manifest
contradiction
making one
thing necessary
& not necessary.

Page. 31. in

Blessed Sacrament, neither to be necessary, nor expediente for the sicke, nor any injury to be done vnto him, if he departe without it. There it serued your turne better to denye the necessitie of it, here to confesse it. So rather then you woulde lacke woordes, and perle to the truth, you thought good for your aduantage to saye, and vsaye, to make one selfe thing necessary, and not necessary.

And what speake you of circumstances of place, time, cause, ende, manner of doing? Shal any Circumstance, change or take away the Institution of Christs? Say you not before in your viij. Diuision, that touching the number of Communicantes together, Christs hath determined the case? Say you not (though vntreuely as here I haue pronounced) that, albeit Christs haue appointed no certaine number of Communicantes, yet he hath by speciall woordes appointed a number? For these woordes (saye you) Take ye, eate ye, drinke ye. &c. necessarily importe a number. Wherefoze it were best you agreed with your selfe, ere you go about to bring other men to agree with you. For if number be necessary, and appointed by speciall woordes of Christs, as you saye there, then is it not lausful for a sicke man to receiue alone, as you say here.

Let it be considered what inconuenience followeth of your doctrine. That there be a number of partakers together at euery Communion, by you it is necessarie. That a sicke man at his departure receiue the Communion, by you also it is necessarie. But what if in that case a number such as you require to be, bee not alwayes ready to receiue? What then remaineth, but that either he passe without it, and so that be not done which is necessary: or that he

In other
contradiction of
M. Iowels
cls.

Page 10.

The inevitable inconuenience of M. Iowels doctrine.

A Reioindre to

receiue alone, and so Christes necessary commaundement to be broken: whereof it must follow, that Christe was not a wise Lawmaker, who provided nothing for the auoiding of such inconuenience, and bindeth a man to that which in some case can not be perfourmed. Thus euery man may see, to what contradictions and absurdities throught the spite of Contention, and gaine saying *M. Jewel* is brought.

But saith *M. Jewel*, although the case of necessitie make single receiuing lausful in the sicke man, yet can not this presidēt make it lausful to be done opely in the church, wheras is no such case of necessitie. Herunto I say: If it be necessitie that maketh single or rather sole receiuing of the Sacrament lausful in the sicke man: the necessitie of the Priest at Masse when others be not disposed to receiue with him being no lesse, yea much moze: the case of necessitie maketh it lausful to be done also by him opely in the church. For when he hath Consecrated the Body of our Lorde, he is bounde to receiue it, for that is the consumation of the Sacrifice. And to that, is alleged by some the scripture, *Sacerdos qui offert hostiam, comedet eam in loco sancto*, The Priest that offereth the hoste, shal eat it in the holie place. Therefore *S. Dionysius* saith, this to be the most seemely order of diuine things, that first the Priest do Communicate of the holy giftes, for so *S. Chrysostome* witnesseth, that Christ him selfe did, likewise *S. Hierome* in his Epistle Ad Hedibiam; and *S. Augustine*, *De doctrina Christiana lib. 2. cap. 3.* That so it ought to be the Fathers of the twelfth Toletane Councel doth both proue, and command very streighly to be euermoze obserued. The Priest then being bound to receiue after that he hath consecrated and offered the Sacrifice, whē as there be none to receiue with him: why he may not receiue alone, you haue yet shewed vs no cause, nor ener shalbe able to shewe.

You:

Leuit. 6.
Ecclesiast.
hierarc.
part. 3. c. 3.
Chrysost.
in cap.
Mat. 26.
Can. 7.
M. Jew.
hath no
cause to
shewe,
why the
Priest
may not
receiue al-
one, in
case of o-
thers re-
fusall.

You will say perhaps, what neede is there at al, that the Priest at Masse celebrate the Sacrifice? Yeas Sir, there is neede. Els Christ would not haue said, Doye this in my remembrance. By this Oblation we renew, and continue the memorie of Chyistes death, and render thanks to God the Father, that by the death of his Sonne, whose Body is offered in this Sacrifice in a Mysterie, he hath redeemed vs. And how so euer this memorie may be renewed, and thanks geuen to God by other meanes: yet this is a special meane, and specially commaunded by Chyiste. And sozasmuch as the memorie of man is fraile, and this is commaunded to be done in remembrance of Chyist: it should not be frequēted, but for a long time be intermitted, we for our parte should seme vnmindful of so greate a benefite, and Chyistes death should not accordyng to his owne Institution be recorded.

wherefore
is the Sa-
crifice to
be celebra-
ted.

LUC. 22.

1: Cor 11.

Iewel.

In case of necessitie a dispensation was graunted to the Priestes of Norwye to consecrate the Mystical cuppe without wine: for that wine being brought into that Countrie by meane of the extreme cold can not last. Yet was it neuer thought lausful for al other Priestes, in all other Churches generally to do the same.

Volaterrā.
Lib. 7.

Harding.

That which you allege here of the dispensation graunted to the Priestes of Norwye to consecrate the Mystical cup without wine, I denye it vterly. There was neuer no such thing graunted. Whether by permission of Innocentius Octauns they celebrated the Sacrifice without wine for cause by you alleged, I affirme nothing: but that they were dispensed with to consecrate the Mystical cuppe without wine, I denie it, and you shal neuer sufficiently proue it. And what so euer Raphael Volaterranus wyteth hereof, it may as sady be contemned, as of

l. iiij.

him.

A Reioindre to

of him it is lightly reported. He liued in our age, and might therein be deceiued by others, as sithens others haue ben deceiued by him. his anthozitie is of smal credit in such a mater. wherefore your Argument depending thereof is of litle force.

As bread and wine are the necessarie mater of y^e most blessed Sacrament by Institution of Chryste, and can not be changed by man: so if a number of communicantes or receiuers together in in one place be of his Institution, as you say it is: no such humaine necessitie can happen, for which his diuine ordinance may lawfully be broken. But the sicke person receiuing the Communion alone, Chrystes Institution is not broken, because the number which is spoken of is not of necessitie alwayes required: therefore neyther by the Priestes sole receiuing at Masse, is it broken, when there are no others worthily prepared to receiue with him. Els must you shewe some weighty cause for which our Lords Institution is kept in the sicke, and broken in the Priest.

The .14. Diuision.

BEcause it were a lengthening of my booke, which I conet to be short, to reherse my wordes which M. Newel hath put into his .12. diuision: I require the good Reader to peruse them, as they are set forth in my Answer to his Challenge. wey them there as thei be vetered, not as he hath mangled them, & as vntwuly he reporteth them in his Replie. The same of them reacheth to this, y^e if no faithful person might at any time receiue the blessed Sacramēt but with moe together in one place: then for y^e enjoying

joying of that necessary benefite, we were bounde to the condi-
tion of a place. And so the Church deliuered by Christ from al
bondage, and set at libertie, should notwithstanding be in seru-
tude and subiection vnder those outward thinges, which S.
Paul calleth infirma & egena elementa, weake and pooze clemen-
tes. So might we be blamed for obseruing places, as the Ga-
lathians were blamed of S. Paul for obseruing dayes, monethes
and times: so should we seme Iustly to retorne againe to the
elementes of the worlde, from which, S. Paul saith we are dead
with Christ, &c.

Conditio
of place.

Galat. 4.

Here M. Jewel first of al picketh a quarel, for that I menti-
oned euery other Christen man or woman, saing, if either the
Priest, or euery other Christen man or woman, might at no time
receiue the Sacrament, but with moe together in one place: then
as is before recited. his Replie is thus.

Iewel.

Here these wordes, euery other Christian man, or woman, that he
hath taken in by the way, are an ouerplus, and * quite from the
purpose.

The. 88.
vntutly.
these
wordes
are not
quite fro
purpose.

Harding.

These wordes I graunt, and the thing by them signified, be
quite from your purpose, but not from our purpose. For if any
other Christen man or woman may lawfully receiue the Sacra-
ment alone, what religion haue you, why the Priest may not
receiue it alone? where you make the Masse vnlawful specially
for the Priestes sole receiuing, the same being founde laulful in
others, the Masse is proued laulful, and defended from your
wicked repprouse.

Iewel.

For the * question is moued, not of any other Manne or Woman,

The. 89.
vntutly.

but

A Reioindre to

There
was no
such que-
stion mo-
ued.

but of the Masse, and onely of the Priest that saith the Masse.

Harding.

who moued that question, I pray you *Syr*: A vaine foolish Challenge you made, for which you haue no thanke of God, you may be sure, nor commendation of men (I thinke verely) which you looked for, no not of the wiser sort of your owne sect, as partly it appeareth by your owne confession. Question you moued none. But because here you seeme to be dyuen to allow sole receiuing in an other Chyristen man or woman, which you can not away with in any person in your Challenging Sermon: it remaineth you shew vs a better cause then you haue hitherto, why you condemne it in the Priest, when he hath consecrated and offered. If you can not, renoue your wicked and foolish Challenge, leaue rayling at the Masse, and subscribe.

Page. 33.
The accus-
tomed
sight of
M. Jew.
when he
hath not
what rea-
sonably to
answer.

Here *M. Jewel* bleth his accustomed sleight. Not being able to answer that I bring against his precise necessitie of a number of Communicants w the Priest together in one place, the better to be able to say somewhat, or rather that he might seme to the ignorant to haue some colour of a iust Replie: he telleth my tale for me, & reporteth my wordes far otherwise then I vttered them my selfe. After that vnttrue dealing vled to y aduantage of his cause, he pretendeth to doubt, whether I scoffe and dally for my pleasure, or speake soothly as I thinke. wherof I marvel why he should so doubt. For who so euer reade my wordes, which the Printer hath in his booke laid together truly, though *M. Jewel* by his vnttrue report do falsifie them: shal sone iudge, I speake them in good sooth, as being such, that haue not so much as any shadow of scoffing.

That flower willingly I leaue to you *M. Jewel*, the pleasure of al other in your garland in y sight of your owne light
light

sorte, and most vnpleasant in the sight of the grane and wise. And as you say here, to scoffe and dally becommeth not the matter, wherein you say truly: so with your owne testimonye you condemne your selfe, who vse it so much without regard of the person you haue put vpon you, and of the sad matter, you haue taken in hande to treat.

At length you resolve in this, That if I spake soothly and as I thinke, then I haue not wel aduised my selfe, neither from what seruitude Christ by his blood hath deliuered vs, nor of what libertie S. Paule speaketh. This being so, that is to say, if I were not wel aduised, but ouersene therein: you haue the more aduantage to replie. Let vs then see your rare cunning, great learning, and high deuise.

Iewel.

Certain it is, Christ hath not deliuered vs from honest Ciuile Policies, without which no State neither Ecclesiastical nor Ciuile can be maintained: but from the curse of the lawe, wherein vve reasted vnder sinne: and from the ceremonies and ordinances geuen by Moses, which for that they were weak according to the imperfection of that time, therefore S. Paule calleth them the Elementes of this world.

Harding.

Three things you speake of, honest Ciuil policies, the curse of the lawe, Ceremonies and ordinances geuen by Moses. First the first you say, Christ hath not deliuered vs, but from the other two: of which the last S. Paule calleth Elements of this world. Now because place, which is vnderstanded when many communicantes be together, that you binde vs vnto, is contained vnder the Ceremonies and ordinances geuen by Moses: therefore if for the enioying of the benefite which we attain by receiuing the Communion, we must needs be together with many in one place:

A Reioindre to

place: I might wel say as I said, that we should notwithstanding the libertie which Chryste hath set vs in, remaine in seruitude and subiection vnder the weake and poore elementes.

That con-
dution of
place is of
the Cere-
monies of
the olde
Lawe.
Exod. &
Leuit. &c.

Galat. 4.

That place is one special thing required by the Ceremonies and ordinances of the olde Lawe, and belonging vnto the same, it is euident by the bookes of the olde Testament. For there we finde, that some thinges were commanded to be done in the court of the Tabernacle, some at the dooze, some in the entrie of the Tabernacle, some within the Tabernacle, some at y^e Altar where beastes were sacrificed; some at y^e Altar of the sweet perfume, some within y^e Waile, some without y^e Waile, some in y^e Tent, some in Sancta Sanctoru, finally, at length they might not sacrifice but in the Temple, and three times in the yeare they were bounde to come to Ierusalem there to make their Oblations. To the like seruitude of place, M^r. Jewel would diue vs, who doth forbidde vs to receiue the Communion, onelesse there be a number of Communicantes together in one place. In consideration whereof, as S. Paule rebuked the Galathians for obseruing times, so he might rebuke vs for obseruing places. Thus is the necessitie of his number receiuing together in one place displaced, as a thing Jewish, if place be conteined vnder the Ceremonies, and ordenaunces of the Lawe appointed vnto the Jewes.

That num-
ber of com-
municantes
be toge-
ther in one
place is by
M^r. Jew-
els graunt
but a Ci-
uile policie

But you say, that your number of Communicantes together in one place, is but an honest ciuil policie. And this seemeth here to be your resolution. Very wel. The same wee accept. But then must you vnderstand, that if it be a ciuil policie, it may be altered and changed, as the gouernours of the state thinke it convenient, to whose commoditie that ciuil policie serueth. And euen so it is in very dede. For somtimes the people receiue with the Bp^{is}, as at Easter, and at other high feastes,
and

and when els any be disposed : some times when none are disposed, he receiveth alone, for in any wise receive he must when so ever he consecraterh and offereth. That diversitie (we see) the custome of the Church hath of longe time approued. And so though the people be seldome ready and worthily prepared to Communicate Sacramentally with the Priest, yet is the unbloudy Sacrifice of the Church by the Priest the Churches publike Minister in that behalfe oftentimes to be offered, and Masse to be celebrated according to Christs commaundement given to Priests at his last Supper.

Jewel.

Here M. Harding semeth by the waye, to touch the English Translation of the Bible, which calleth such Elementes Beggarly Ceremonies, him selfe being not able to translate it better. And yet if he were well apposed, I thinke he would hardly yeelde any great difference betwene the Greke worde $\pi\lambda\alpha\chi\alpha$, and the Latine worde Egena, and this English worde Beggarly. Which worde if it seeme to homely, yet S. Hierome in his exposition is as homely, calling *it Vilem intelligentiam Traditionum. And yet the Prophetes abuse it further. Hieremie calleth such Ceremonies so abused, and others devised by Men, Chasse, Syvill, Drosse, and Dreames: Esaie, Filth: Zacharie, Curses: Ezechiel, Mans douring. And other like.

The. 90.
but truth.
S. Hiero
callecth not
the ordina
ces of
Moses
Law so.

Harding.

I must looke for smal currensie at your handes, I see wel M. Jewel, sith that you are disposed to reppone not only what I saye expressly, but also what I seeme to touch by the waye. where you can not abyde any thing of your Gospelling proceedings so much as to seeme to bee touched by mee, and that but by the waye, not of professed purpose: How will you abyde to see the Chief partes of

m 4 pont

A Reioindre to

Q. Jew. your new Gospel, partly by me, but much more by others, and onely touched, but also launced, cutte, pearced throught, & word and quite throwen downe to the ground: what? you are very nice and tender, that could not beare with me reporting S. Pauls wordes, infirma & egena elementa, to signifie weake & beggarly Ceremonies after the English Bibles translation. Are you come of their race, who are called, you know by whom, Genus irritabile vatum? Are you so waspish?

Q. Jew.
nice ten-
deresse.

Elemēta
englished
Cere-
monies.

But touching the thing it selfe, why seemed I to you, to touch your English Bibles translation for turning the Apostles word $\pi\lambda\omega\chi\alpha$ in Greeke, Latined egena, into this worde beggarly, rather then for turning the other word $\sigma\omega\iota\chi\alpha$, elementa, elementes in english, into this worde Ceremonies? Thinke you not, that the one is with as litle reason called in the translation Ceremonies, as the other is with semelimesse englished beggarly? If the terme beggarly liked you and your fellow Gospellers wel, whercof I strive not much with you: wherefore chaunged you the most conuenient worde in that place Elementes, into Ceremonies? why would you not egena elementa, to be englished beggarly elementes?

Doubtlesse that ye might the rather bring al holy Ceremonies into contempt and despise, against which you beare endles hatred: you liked better for poore or needy Elementes (for so S. Pauls owne wordes do signifie) to put in your publike translation, beggarly Ceremonies, that the sound of so vile a word oftentimes falling into y^e peoples eares, might dyue into their hearts a vile estimation of al Ceremonies of holy Church. For this your vnttrue Translation I am sure your defence is but beggarly. But let vs see, first what good reason you haue to turne $\pi\lambda\omega\chi\alpha$, egena, paupertina, as S. Hierome termeth, into beggarly, and not rather into poore, or nedy: Next, why ye turne $\sigma\omega\iota\chi\alpha$ elementa

In cōment
in 4 caput
ad Galat.

elementa, into Ceremonies, rather then into Elementes, or Begin-
nings, for so S. Hierome also sheweth it to signifie.

There is no great difference (say you) betwene the Greke ^{Of this} and Latine worde, and the English woorde Beggary. ^{terme} Yeas Beggary
S; by your fauour, there is so great difference, that whereas
the one is applied to our Saniour Christe, the other may not so
be applyed without offence of godly eares. S. Paule saith of
Christe, Propter vos egenus factus est, cum esset diues: vt illius 2. Cor. 8.
inopia vos diuites essetis. Though he were rich, yet for your
sakes he became poore, that ye through his pouertie, might bee
made rich. The Greke hath the same worde, which you haue
turned into beggary. Now I reposit me to the Christian eares,
whether they would not glow and be offended, if any would be
so impudent, or rather impious, as to say, that Christe was beg-
gary, and that we are enriched by his beggarlines. Aske any
Iewel of any pooze body that requirerh your Almoze, what he
is, be it man or woman: and you shal heare answered I warrant
you, I am a pooze man, a pooze woman, or a pooze creature, and
not I am a beggary mā, a beggary womā, a beggary creature.
The worde being such as impeyterh a contempt, and soundeth
not grauely in so sadde a mater: the translation had been moze
conuenient, if for egenā, ye had put Poore, and not Beggarye, ^{πωχά,}
specially the Greke worde being ^{πωχικά}, not ^{πωχικά}, which ^{In comment}
rather soundeth your terme Beggary. ^{epist. ad}

And seing that Heretikes, as S. Hierome saith, of that we ^{gal. cap. 4.}
cal Moyses law weake and pooze Elementes, take occasion to ^{I reason}
say euil of the Creator, because he hath created the worlde, and ^{why we}
made the lawe: we should rather cal the lawe pooze Elements, ^{should}
then Beggary Elementes, for that so we should minister fur- ^{turne the}
ther occasion to the Heretikes to blasphemē our Creator. ^{Greke}
^{woorde}
^{πωχά,}
^{Poore,}
^{rather the}
^{Beggary}

A. Reioindre to

Ibidem.

N. Jew.

falsifieth

S. Hiero.

That this worde should not seeme to vs ouer homely, you allege S. Hierome, saying that he in his exposition is as homely, calling it, (whereby you meane Moyses lawe) vilem intelligentiam Traditionum. But you falsifie S. Hierome after your common manner. S. Hierome in that place speaketh not of the ceremonies and ordinances geuen by Moyses, where of you speake: but of the Jewes Traditions, and of their wrong vnderstanding of the lawe according to the letter. which Iustly vnderstanding of the lawe according to y^e outward letter, he calleth vile. You haue altered the words of S. Hierome to frame a sentence to your purpose, whereas he hath no such order of words as you allege, vilem intelligentiam Traditionū, but otherwise. Neither calleth he the law it selfe vile and beggerly, as you do, but the misvnderstanding of the lawe according to the letter, he calleth vile in comparison of the spiritual vnderstanding.

*corix^{ix},
elemēta,
not wel
englished
ceremo-
nies.*

Coloss. 2.

why the translatours of your English Bible haue turned the Greke worde *corix^{ix}*, *elementa* in latine, into *ceremonies*, you shewe no reason, nor in deede none haue you to shew, for which, as wel as for your vnseemely worde beggerly, I might haue noted the translation. First although the ceremonies of Moyses lawe were elementes, yet elementes signifie not ceremonies, the worde is more general. And seeing that the Apostle calleth the thinges here weake and poore elementes, after the minde of S. Hierome, which in the first parte of the chapter he calleth the elementes of this world: whereof mention also is made in the epistle to the Colossians: what reason had the Translatours, here to turne the worde *Ceremonies*, and there, *ordinances*? Verely by good reason they should not haue turned the worde neither ordinances nor ceremonies. For beside that the Greke worde doth not properly so signifie, the place being this in S. Paule.

S. Paule, quomodo conuertimini iterum ad, &c. how is it that ye turne againe to the weake & poore elementes: *Galat. 4.* *Galat. 4.* Galathias could not turne againe to the ceremonies of Moyses law, because they had neuer ben accustomed vnto them. For they came to the faith from Paganisme, and not from Iudaisme.

But because before their conuersion to the faith of Christe through S. Pauls preaching, they worshipped the Sunne, the moone the Goddess of the hilles and *In com.* wooddes, and other vaine thinges of the worlde after the superstition of the Heathens: S. Paule might wel saye vnto them, howe is it, that ye turne again vnto the weake and poore Elementes? Thus is that place to be expounded, if by the word elementes, such Ethnick superstitions be signified. Els if the lawe of Moyses be signified, then is the word taken metaphozically, & beside his special propriete, and signifieth Rudimentes, principles, and beginnings. which signification of the worde lyeth pour one Maister Caluine better, then an other. Neither is that beside the minde of S. Hierome. For God whose soze purpose was as the time by his wil appointed to cal the worlde vnto perfite knowledge of the truth, would in the meane time instruct and teache men with these rudimentes and principles as it were of Moyses lawe, and for that purpose he vouchesafed to set vp a schoole in one only corner of the worlde.

The lawe of Moyses and the Prophetes saith S. Hierome, *Ibidem.* may be taken for the elementes of letters. For as we learne the letters not for any profite of them only, but of an other thing: to chintent by ioyning syllables and wordes together, we may come to the reading and vnderstanding of speeches, sentences, orations and bookes, in which the sense and order of wordes is moze considered, then the beginninges and order of letters: Right so by Moyses Lawe, by the Ceremonies and
m. iij. ordinaunces.

A Reioindre to

2. Cor. 5.

Iohan. 1.

ordinances thereof, and by the Prophetes, men were lead vnto the knowledge of Christ, and learned a further lesson by the law, then was founde in the outward letter of the lawe. In this sense where the elements of this worlde by the interpretation be the lawe and the Prophetes, this worlde is taken for them that be in the worlde, as in S. Paule, God was in Christ reconciling the world vnto him selfe: and in the Gospell, the world was made by him, and the worlde knewe him not. Thus you see M. Acton, what good occasion I had to touch by the way your English Bibles translation, which hath for poore or needie Elementes, beggerly Ceremonies. which you might wel haue dissembled, but that your guilty conscience would nedes betray the offence.

The Prophetes whom here you allege without notice of place, applied not those wordes of vilenes, to the contempt of Moses lawe and ordinances, whereof mention was made: but of mennes inuentions, fantasies, and traditions contrary to Gods ordinances, whereof the place treated containeth no mention. And therefore is your reporte of the Prophetes wordes of reuiling, quite beside the purpose.

Ieruel.

To condition of a place, saith M. Harding, were mere Iuisb: for as S. Paule saith to the Galathians, ye obserue monethes, and daies, so might he say vnto you, ye obserue places. Thus he saith, as though he him selfe had no choise of place to say his Masse in.

Harding.

Choise of
place to
say Masse
in, is of
Ecclesi-
astical
order.

Let my wordes be considered, as I utter them, not as you disorder them: and then replie against them what you can. Here you say nothing, that is worth the answering. That we haue choise of a place to say Masse in, I graunt, what conclude you thereof? So haue you choise of a place to dine and suppe in, and choise of a place to sleepe in. But this haue you by civile order,
and

and that other haue we by ecclesiastical order. That we haue a certain place appointed for the celebration of the Masse, it is not of Chyffes Institution, but of mans ordinaunce. And therefore we thinke not our selues bounde so straightly in this case, but that when occasion so requireth, by license ordinarily obtained, we may change the ordinary place, which is a consecrated altier in a consecrated Church or Chappel; and hauing that by order is requisite, may say Masse in a priuat house or chamber, in a kitchin or pavilion.

If you acknowledge your number of communicantes which you require to be together to receiue the Sacrament with the priest in one place, to be likewise not of Chyffes Institution, which may not at all be broken, but of mans ordinaunce, and so to be of mere ciuile policie: then we agree with you so farre. For so is it not of necessitie and invariable, as Chyffes commaundementes and Institutions be: but of congruence, and so as in certaine cases it may be changed. Therefore there is no offence committed touching this point on the priestes behalfe, when lacking a number to receiue with him in the same place, at his Masse he receiueth the oblation alone, though so he communicate not alone; which thing being graunted, as you M. Jewell haue here before graunted, in that you reserve the place to Ciuile policie: it remaineth that you reserue your selfe Article, and inueigh not so much agaynst priuate Masse. Els if you binde the priest neuer to receiue, but when he hath a number to receiue with him: the because many can not receiue with him but in the same place, you binde him to necessitie of place for the enioying of the benefite, which we receiue by taking the blessed Sacrament.

Marke wel the point M. Jewell that we agree in, and that other point in which we dissent. That there bee a number of Communicantes, and that many do communicate, I graunte.

n i But

The point
wherein
M. Jew.
and we
dissent.

A Reioindre to

But that the Sacrament be not receiued of one alone in a place but that many come together into one place to receiue, as though els it were no communion: that I denye. That a number of communicantes was at Chyffes supper, it is graunted. That a number should alwayes receiue with the priest, that is denied & can not be proued. A title of place for Communicantes to receiue together in, is denied to be of Chyffes Institution, or otherwise of precise necessitie: to be of great congruence, it is not denyed. When so euer you replie, if you proue not this, and that substantially, and closely you proue nothing, which if you proue not, then ought you to subscribe vnto the approbation of the blessed Masse. You neede not for this to trouble the worlde with booke of much talks, of which sorte your replie is, full of wordes for thewe to the simple and cuntye of iust proues. A sentence or two, or three at the most, wil serue your turne, if you haue them.

Leuell
He moueth talks of place, vvhetherof we had no question: but the number of Communicantes, vvhetherof S. Paule so plainly speaketh, he thought best to saue with silence.

Harame

How much it is necessary that they who receiue the Sacrament together, be in a place together: so much pertained the talke of place to the purpose. Touching the number of communicantes, it is to be noted that the saying of S. Paul to the Rom. Ananias, and how those wordes, expresse in many, a charge one for another, be to be vnderstanded of the church teastes, and not of receiuing the Sacrament specially: herof I haue spoken before in the 2. Question.

After this way. I will enter into a common place of saying, and replye out after his preaching manner. O good reader, I directh gracious matter against vs, that we haue deuided the Lordes Sacraments

1. Cor. 12.

See the last division.

Page 34.

Lib. 1.

cap. 1.

sec. 1.

art. 1.

q. 1.

ramentes with superstitious ceremonies, that we burden the peoples consciences with choise of meates, that we keepe Bachelers, Monkes, Priests, and Nunnes, from Marriage, and lay an intolerable yoke vpon them, that we teach the doctrine of devils, & many other detestible matters, that I list not here to reherse. For answere wherunto I remitte the Reader to my Confutation of their Apologie. The most pointes and in maner all here so bitterly cryed out vpon, there haue I sufficiently answered. Now let vs see what fault els he findeth with vs.

Jewel.

Howe he is M. Harding hath wel disclosed him selfe herein, that this libertie is nothing els, but to do what him listeth: & his bondage nothing els, but to be subiect vnto God. For he addeth immediately, that the mingling and blinding of water and wine together, & thintentio of the priest, are things necessarily required to the Consecration of this Sacrament.

Harding.

Do you not see M. Jewel, what a foolish arguer you make? He that answered your Challenge saith, these things be necessarily required to this Sacrament by Christs Institution, either declared by written Scriptures, or taught by the holy Ghost, bread and wine mingled with water for the matter, the due wordes of consecration for the forme, and the priest rightly ordered having intention to do, as the Church doth, for the ministerie, for these be the wordes wherewith he hath disclosed him selfe herein, that his libertie is nothing els, but to do what him listeth. How prone you this Argument to good use? How hangs the parties together? where lay your Logike, when you lay downe this simple Inhero, the? you should haue spoken better reason, as haue holden your peace. Your true promises, who are your chief fauourers, can not but iustifie this your vnsanctified talke.

u ij wel

A Reioindre to

Wel sye, of the foure thinges requisite to this Sacrament, you take vpon you to deface the estimation of two, the mixture, and the priestes intention. Therof specially of the one thus you say.

Of mingling vvater vvith the vvine in
the Sacrifice.

Ierred. Some saye.

The. 91.
Verith.
Thys is
falle, for
olde fa-
thers ma-
ke accopt
of it.
Cyprian.
contra A-
quarios.
Iustin. in
Apolog. 2.
S. Iew.
contrariety
hun selfe.

Of the first hereof (that is to say of mingling vvater vvith the vvine) the superstition only excepted, no man maketh any great accompt. In dede S. Cyprian and certayne olde fathers speake of it, and force it much: and Iustinus Martyr calleth it πορνειον υδατος και κρατους, the cuppe of vvater and mixture.

Harding.

why do you except superstition? who euer complayned of superstition committed, in that the wyne is tempered with vvater? But sye, wrote you this in your dreame? Dange your sainges together beter then a sicke mans dreame? S. Cyprian in dede (say you) and certayn olde fathers speake of it, and force it much: yet no man maketh any great accompt of it. Is S. Cyprian no man? Are the olde fathers no men? Yea they speake of it, (and o Lord how earnestly speake they of it, specially S. Cyprian) and force it much: yet will you say, they make none accompt of it? He that speaketh of a thing so seriously, and forceth it so much, as S. Cyprian doth this, maketh he no great accompt of it? what make you the blessed Quirke and learned Bishop S. Cyprian a dissembler? An hypocrite? A double man? wyl you haue his belent, that he vttered all the force he couide to perswade this matter of mingling vvater vvith wyne saye? hold oblation, & perswaded not greatly whether it were observed or no? made he not any great accompt of it? How could he otherwise signifie a great accompt?

accept he made of it, the so to wrire of it as he wrore to Celsius: *Cyprian. li. 2. epist. 3.*
 Saith he nor that our Lord him selfe both so did at his Supper, & commaunded so to be done? Saith he not, Non mane, sed post coenam mixtum calicem obtulit Dominus, That not in the morning, but after Supper, our Lorde offered the mingled cuppe? Saith he not also there, that he was admonished of our Lorde, that the cuppe which is offered vp in commemoration of him, be mingled with water? To proue that, both he not shew by many similitudes of the Fathers of the olde Testament, and by testimonies of the Prophetes, the same to haue ben before signified? Briefly is there any thing moze earnestly treated and perswaded of S. Cyprian, then this mixture of water with the wine in the celebration of the daily Sacrifice? Yet saith M. Iewel, no man maketh any great accompt of it. What is a manifest Contradiction, if this be not? Beleeue him good Reader in the rest of his doctrine, as thou seest cause to beleeue him in this.

Iewel.

But neither *Christ, nor any of his Disciples, euer gaue commaundement of it: neither was it at any time in the Church vniuersally received, or accompted necessary. For Scotus and Innocentius witnesse, that the Greke Church in their time used it not. Wherefore it can not be iudged Catholike.

Harding.

That it is not expressely written in the Gospel: I graunt. That Christ commaunded it S. Cyprian seemeth to say. For he calleth it our Lordes Tradition, and Diuinitus institutū, a thing instituted by God, he saith that our Lorde both did it, and also taught it. He seemeth to reckon it among those commaundementes, which he calleth in comparison of the least, Tam magna, tam grandia, tam ad ipsum Dominice passionis & nostrae redemptionis Sacramenti pertinencia mandata: So great, so weighty,

Contradiction.

The 91. Intrinsecally both Christ and the Apostles ordained it, as here it is produced.

The 93. Intrinsecally the contrary is reported by the general council.

Admirable of the chalice, in our Lordes Tradition.

A Reioindre to

Synod 6.

Can. 32.

A traditi-
on from
God.

A traditi-
on of the
Apostles.

The mix-
ture of the
chalice ob-
serued in
all the
Church.

commandements, & so much pertaineth to þe Sacrament of our
Lords passion & of our redemption. The learned Fathers of þe
general Councel call it, *Ordinem diuinitus traditum*, An order de-
liuered to the Church by God. They saye also that it was a
Tradition of þe Apostles, & that it was obserued in all the Church,
where spiritual lightes haue shined. You must heare with vs
M^r. Jewel; if we esteeme S. Cyprians authoritie, and that ge-
neral Councel more then your bare saying.

If it be a Tradition of our Lord, as S. Cyprian saith it is,
if it be deliuered by God, and by the Apostles, as the sixth Coun-
cel reporteth: then may we reasonably thinke, that the Apostles,
when they offered the diuine Oblation, vsed to mingle water wth
the wine, as Christ taught them both by his example, and by his
tradition, and that they deliuered the same to their posterite.

Merely S. Clement declaring the manner how Christ offered at
his Supper, saith thus. Likewise mingling the cuppe of wine
and water, and cōsecrating it, he gaue it vnto the, saying, drinke
ye al, &c. S. James mentioneth the same in his Liturgie: S.
Basil likewise in his Liturgie, and S. Chrysostome also in his.

Neither was it at any time saith M^r. Jewel, in the Church uni-
uersally receiued, or accompted necessarie. This we deny. How can
he proue it? For Scotus and Innocentius saith he, do witnesseth that
the Greeke Church in their time vsed it not. I marvel how he can be
so bold, as to scotte so commonly at other mens Arguments, & ma-
keth such preuious Arguments him self. What Child would reas-
on thus? Scotus and Innocentius do witnesseth, that mingling of
wine and water in the Oblatio was not vsed among the Greekes
in their time, which was of late yeares: Ergo it was not at any
time in the Church vniuersally receiued.

Although it were not vsed of the Greekes at that
time, might it not haue ben vsed generally at other times before?

Clemens
Constitut.
Apost. lib.
S. cap. 17.
Liturgie.
Iacobi.
Basilij.
Chrysost.
Io. Scot. in
4. sentent.
dist. 11.
quest. 6.
Innocent.
de officio
Miss. part.
1. c. 4.

If he had inferred, Ergo it was not vniuersally receiued and v-
sed of the Church at that time, he had wel concluded, this being
supposed, that the Grekes were not by schisme departed from y
church: but now y he sheweth, ergo it was not at any time vni-
uersally receiued, he sheweth him self to vse very simple Logike,
what so euer Scote saith hereof touching the Grekes, it is
of no better authoritie then y is which Innocentius reporteth,
for him doth Scote allege. Now Innocentius saith no more
but this. *Græcorum Ecclesia dicitur aquam non apponere*
Sacramento. The Greeke Church is said not to put water in-
to the Sacrament. whether it were so or no, he doth not as-
sume it, onely he telleth what is reported. Now if this report
were not true, as many such made of Countries farre of be vn-
true: they sh. Jewel beside the losse of his best Argument, hath
lost his whole cause touching that point.

But what saith it what the Grekes did for three hundred
yeares past, who were then fallen into schisme and heresie tou-
ching procession of the holy Ghoste? The example of Schis-
matikes and Heretikes ought not, we may not be alleged to the
preiudice of any doctrine, ordinance, or custome of the Catho-
like Church. And here it is to be considered, how little good
reason sh. Jewel vseth for maintenance of his vaine Challenge,
that bindeth vs to the compasse of the first six hundred yeares
after Christe for prouise of the Catholike doctrine, and he for dis-
prouise of it, vsurpeth helpees of al ages and al writers, be they ne-
uer so little worthy to be esteemed. Therefore notwithstanding
the Grekes contrarie schismatical vse, the mingling of the sacred
cup may wel seme to haue ben vniuersally receiued in y Church,
and that it was Catholique.

For good prouise herof, we are wel able to shew, y this was
receiued in the west Churches, first in Europa, by y testimonies
of S. Clement, who liued with the Apostles, and was bishop of

Answer to
Scotus &
Innocen-
tius.
De officio
Missæ lib.
1. cap. 6.

sh. Jewel
runneth to
schisma-
tikes and
heretikes
for helpe.

Witnesses
proving
the ming-
ling of con-
secrated
water
hath ben
vniuersal.
Clement
lib. 3. c. 17.

A Reioindre to

Alexander Rome: of S. Alexander Pope and Martyr, neare the Apostles
Papa. time: of S. Irenaeus lib. 5. who came to Lions in France, and
Iren. lib. 5. was Byshop there: of S. Ambrose Bishop of Milan, lib. 4. De
Ambrose. Sacramentis, cap. 5. & lib. 5. cap. 1. Of the Councel Aransican holden
Cō Arans. in France, Can. 17. of the thirde Councel of Braccara in
Council. Spaine, Can. 1. Then in Africa by the testimonies of S. Cy-
Braccarē. prian ad Cæciliū above alleged: of S. Augustine De dogmat.
Cyprian. Ecclesiast. dogmate. 75. of y^e third Councel of Carthage, can. 24.
August. Then in the East Churches, as in Hierusalem, and Syria, by y^e
Cō. Car. 3. testimonies of S. James Liturgie: of S. Iustinus y^e Martyr, in
Iacobus in Apologia, 2. of Eusebius Emisennus, Homilia: 5. de pascha: of
Liturgia. Damascenus, lib. 4. cap. 14: In Asia the lesser, by testimonies of
Iustinus. S. Basile in Liturgia: of Gregorius Nyssenus, in Sermonē Ca-
Euse. Em. techetico, as it is alleged by Euthymius in Panoplia. lib. 2. titul.
Damascen 21: of the Chapters of the Greke Synodes. cap. 55.
Greg. Nys.

Chrysost. In Grece, and other countries of the East Church, by tes-
Concil. 6. timonies of S. Chrysostome, in Liturgia, Homil. 84. in Iohan. &
Constant. Homil. 14. in 1. Cor. Of the sixth general Councel, where there
Theophy- was a special decree made therof against the Armenians: can. 32.
lactius. of Theophylactus in Iohan. cap. 19: I trow these are testi-
 monies sufficient, to counteruaile the vncertaine hearlsape of
 Innocentius tertius alleged by Score, for proufe that the cu-
 stome of mingling water and wine together in the Sacrifice,
 was generally receiued.

The 94.
 vntrech.

Neither
 I say so.

The 95.
 vntrech.

nor Scores
 faith in

the 96.
 hath testi-

fied both
 our failings

and

I say so.

And touching the necessitie thereof, Scotus saith in plaine vordes,
 Hic vino apponere aquam non est simpliciter necessarium de ne-
 cessitate Sacramenti. Hic vides thes. Doctores agere nos. In
 Harding * saith, this mixture is necessarie to the Sacrament: * Scotus saith
 it is not necessary.

Harding.

If you had englished Scores wordes, your falsifying woud
 haue

have appeared: He saith not, this mixture is not necessary: but is not necessary simply or absolutely: of the necessity of the Sacrament. *In 4. Sent. dist. 11. in fine.*

Scottus and I agree. For although he say, to put water to the wine, it is not simply necessary, that is absolutely and without any exception, so as to be not a Sacrament, if in some case the water be omitted: yet he saith in the same place, which beside all plaine dealing you dissimble and least out-right taken de necessitate ministrari, it is necessary on behalf of the Minister, for that it is commanded by the Church, & because Christ consecrated the cuppe wherein water was mingled with wine, as S. Cyprian in his Epistle to Cecilius, and Damascenus do say. And I say that to this Sacrament are necessarily required, bread and wine mingled with water for the matter. *Damascenus lib. 4. cap. 5.*

Now will you see how we agree. Scote saith the mingling is not simply necessary of the necessity of the Sacrament, the same. For so I learne of S. Cyprian, who he saith that if any of our predecessours by ignorance or simplicitie have not observed that, which our Lorde both by example and instruction hath taught vs to do, this simplicitie may be pardoned by our Lordes fauour. But we can not be excused, who now be taught of our Lorde to offer the cuppe mingled, as our Lorde offered. *Scottus and I do agree.*

S. Cyprian would neuer so have pardoned & omitted of that which he had knowne simply and absolutely to be necessary of the necessity of so great a Sacrament.

Scote saith, it is necessary, de necessitate ministrari, on the behalf of the Minister, that is to say, it is necessary that the Minister offer so, and none otherwise. I say so also. And to that purpose these my wordes, necessarily required to the Sacrament for the matter, I say not, absolutely of the necessity of the Sacrament.

308

ment, but necessarily required to the Sacrament for the water, because, that the Sacrament be so consecrated and offered, it is required on the Ministers behalfe. And if he do not mingle water with the wine, he syneth deadly. And therefore I might well say therof, that it is necessarily required to the Sacrament. For I say not, as **Mr. Jewel** falsifieth my wordes, this mixture is necessary to the Sacrament, but speaking of things that be necessarily required to the Sacrament, I name bread, and wine mingled with water for the water. A thing may be necessarily

required to a Sacrament, because of the precept of the Church, which unto the Minister is bounde, and yet the same not simply of the necessity of the Sacrament: As certaine things be to be observed at the Sacrament of Baptisme, which among the Gospellers we see lesse vndone: yet that notwithstanding it is a Sacrament **Mr. Jewel** perceiue. **Mr. Jewel** hath **Mr. Jewel** acknowledged, and therefore had not neede any disageeing betweene him and me: if he had been so desirous to vnder the church, as he was disposed to gainesay me, and to contrarie my sayings.

Chap. 9. **The pouring of the water on the ground is no part of our mystery.** **Mr. Jewel** hath **Mr. Jewel** acknowledged, and therefore had not neede any disageeing betweene him and me: if he had been so desirous to vnder the church, as he was disposed to gainesay me, and to contrarie my sayings.

Gen. 9.

For the pouring of the water on the ground is no part of our mystery. **Mr. Jewel** hath **Mr. Jewel** acknowledged, and therefore had not neede any disageeing betweene him and me: if he had been so desirous to vnder the church, as he was disposed to gainesay me, and to contrarie my sayings.

not.

not done: But thus it appeared what little good water you haue
to charge vs with al, that for stuffing of your booke you are dis-
ment to fynde fault with a droppe of water poured on the ground.
were you in these parties, you should not see that to scoffe at
but the water reverently taken out of a cruze with a little silver
spoon. Thereof you may iudge how little account is to be made
of that, whereat you make such a merry sporte. The rest of your
foolish scoffes wherewith you haue made your selfe merry in this
Division, I contemne. Beware you meete not with such one
day, as shal least you out of your coat.

Here, as this Dicke scorner goeth forth in his scoffing, ac-
holy thinges, so he uttereth good store of lies. whyles he scoffeth
at the Intention of the Priest, among other vayne toyes he
saith thus.

For the Intention of the Church of Rome is to consecrate
the bread and wine. The Greek Church hath another
Intention, as it is plaine by the Council of Florence. The Intention of the
Church of Rome is to consecrate with Christs wyordes: The Intention
of the Greke Church is to consecrate with prayers. And whether of these
churches the priest shal saye with his Intention? This is the very danger
of vncertaintye.

As this traitor hath said to his scoffing hearts could detest
against the mingling of water with the wine, that is ought to be
for the matter of the Sacrament, so here also he hath attempted
to saye what he saw against that the Catholike Church teacheth
touching the Intention of the Priest: That altogether vnderly,
and so as becometh a prophane mother of the holy Mysterie.

Thy. Jew.
leueth not
without a
scoffe so
much as a
droppe of
water tak-
en on the
grounde.

Jewel

The. 97.
vnttruth.
No such
thing ap-
peareth, for
betweene the
churches
The. 98.
vnttruth.
The. 99.
vnttruth.
There is
no such
thing ther
made plai.
The. 100
vnttruth.
That is
not the
Greke
churches
intention.

A Reioindre to

It appeareth saith Dr. the Church is not yet resolved vpon
one Intention.

Year 572. It appeareth right wel by the common custome,
doctrine, consent, and publike profession of the whole Catholike
Church, that touching the blessed Sacrament of the altar, it is
resolved vpon one vniuersall Intention. Which is to do that
Christe at his supper did, and commaunded his disciples, and
their successors likewise, of the new testament to doo,
with this commaing, That is, our mater had, with the wordes of
Christe to consecrate his body and his blood. What haue you to
say to the contrary?

Jewel. For the Intention (say you) of the Church of Rome is to worke the
Transubstantiation of Bread and wine. The Greke Church had neuer that
Intention, as it is plaine by the Councel of Florence. Do you scisse and
dally so. Jewel herein after your common manner? O speake
you soothly, and as you thinke. If you dally, it becommeth not
the mater, if you speake in sooth, and as you iudge: then are you
of the number of them, whom S. Paul reproveth, who under-
stand not neither, what thinges they speake, neither whereof they
affirme. The Intention of the catholike Church, which for spite
you cal the Church of Rome, is not by any vertue or power of
man to worke the Transubstantion (as it liketh you to terme it)
of bread and wine. It intendeth not to do, that of it selfe it
can not do.

To worke the transubstantiation of bread and wine princi-
pally, is to change the substance of any thing into another sub-
stance, it passeth mans power of him selfe. It is God only that
kneweth to create substances, and turneth the substance of one thing
into the substance of another thing. What man knoweth herein, he
sheweth himselfe as the minister of God. The Intention of the
Church is to consecrate the body and blood of Christe with the
wordes

wordes of Christ pronounced by a Priest, by vertue of which wordes the substance of the bread is changed into the substance of our Lordes body, and the substance of the wine is changed into the substance of his blood. The worke of this marvelous and divine Transubstantiation is to be ascribed to the power of the holy Ghost working by the worde as the author, and to the Priest pronouncing the worde as the minister. Whereof S. Chrysostome speaketh notably saying. Non sunt humane virtutis hæc opera, quæ tunc in illa cena consecravit ipse nunc quoque operatur, ipse perficit, ministrorum nos ordinem tenemus qui vero hæc sanctificat, & transmutat, ipse est. These workes be not of mans power, which Christ wrought at that supper: he it is that now also worketh, he performeth; as for us, we do but holde the office of ministers: but he it is in him selfe that sanctifieth & chaungeth these thinges.

Chrysost.
hom. 33. in
Matt.

whereas you say, the Breke Church had never that Intention, if you meane Intention to consecrate the body and blood of Christ: it is starkes false, and you helpe the Breke Church. It hath ever intended in the celebration of the bread and wyne (so S. Chrysostome and others cal them) to do as the Latine church doth, that is to say, to consecrate the body and blood of our Lord. which thing appeareth evidently by the Liturgies of S. Basile, and of S. Chrysostome, and by sundry plates of S. Chrysostome, and the other good Fathers workes, as partly I have before declared. In dede the word of Transubstantiation (I graunt) is not common to the Breke church, as neither was it to the Latine church before the Council of Laterane: but the faith and doctrine which the word of secme implieth, hath ever from the beginning ben common to both Churches: that is, when these wordes of our Lord, This is my body, this is my blood, be duly pronounced by a Priest: that then the bread is changed and con-

The faith
of Tran-
substan-
tiation gene-
ral to al
times, and
places.

M. Jew.
reporteth
a great
vnttruth of
the Coun-
cel of Flo-
rence.

altered into the body, and the wine into the blood of Christ. But that the Greke church had neuer that Intention; you say, it is plaine by the Cosiel of Flozence: and that al men might be witnesses of your vnttruth, you referre the reader vnto the last Session of this Council. Read the last Session, or the whole Flozentine Council, who wil: be that fynde nothing, wherby it may appeare, that the Greke church had neuer this Intention. This much we fynde there in depe, that, when the Grekes had accorded to the Latines touching the Profession of the holy ghost out of the Sonne, for which specially that Cosiel was assembled, also touching the Popes Supremacie, Purgatorie, and the indifferencie of bread for the Sacrament, wherby it be leuened or unleuened, so it be of wheate, to shew the one church should not condemn the other for the diuersitie of bread: after al these matters ended and agreed vpon, the Pope there present required, the question of the diuine Transmutation of the bread to be debated in the Council.

The question of Transubstantiation was introduced to be debated in the Council of Florence, but not treated of at all. To this demaunde the Grekes made answer, that they had no authority to treat of any other question, without a Commission of the whole East church. Yet they promised to referre it to Palaeologus their Emperour of Constantinople at that time present in Flozence. But both he and the Greke Bishops being weary of their long carrying from home, and desirous to returne to their countrie, fearing that if they entered once into reasoning of that question, they should carry there longer then they would: hancing after mature disputation graunted and agreed to the other foure pointes that were proponed: they refused to dispute and create further of any other point. And so was the question of Transubstantiation left vntouched in that Council. And this is al that is reported thereof in the last

last Session of the Florentine Council. Whereof of this or any thing that there is said, M. Jewel can not with any reason conclude, that the Greke Church had never the Intention, of which I haue now spoken.

And whereas he sayth, that the Intention of the Greke church is to consecrate with prayers, if he meane that the Grekes consecrate not with Chyestes wordes: this is as false as that he said before. Touching this matter, it is plainly declared in the last Session of that Florentine Council, that when the Latines had demanded of the Grekes, why after the wordes of our Lorde by which Consecration is beleeued to be made, they wold say also this prayer: *Et fac panem quidem hunc. &c.* And make this bread the honorable body of thy Christe, and that which is in this cuppe the honorable blood of thy Christe, thy holy spirit changing them: They answered, that they beleeued steadfastly, the Sacrament to be made and consecrated with the wordes of our Lorde: But as the Latines aske that the Sacrament is Consecrated, wold say this prayer, Commaunde O Lorde these thinges to be borne vnto thy high altar by the handes of thy holy Angell: Then so, the Grekes (said they) be wont to pronounce those wordes, that the most holy body and blood of Christe may be made to the remission of our sinnes, and saluation of our soules. Thus saue be the wordes of the Council.

And M. Jewel, they answered, that the Greke church steadfastly beleeued the Sacrament to be made, and Consecration to be perfected by the wordes of our Lorde, this is my body, this is my blood, pronounced by the same. This they say true, as for trial of it I referre me to the Council it self, as it is for founde

whether
the Greke
church do
consecrate
with pray
ers, as M.
Jewel me
neth, or
with our
Lordes
owne
wordes.
*Sessio
ultima
Concilij
Florentini.*

A Reioindre to

what remaineth but that you recant your notorious lye made upon the Breke church, that their Intention is to consecrate with prayers, and not with Christs wordes?

Can you haue any better witness hereof, then the Council it selfe? If you replie for some colour of your defence, that Nicol. laus Cabasilas, and one or two moe besides were of that opinion, what is that to your purpose? what are two or thier to the whole Breke church? If singular error were in some, what prouise maketh that against the whole? Neither speake you of a few decreed Schismatikes, but of the Breke church. And what so euer they haue said for thanouching thereof, it is very sufficiently and substantially confuted by the learned Breke Cardinal Bellarion. For your parte therefore M. Iewel, I must here be so bolde as to tel you, that lyes make no prouise. If they could truly serue to that purpose, then were my booke by your replie amply confuted. Use more truth, when so euer you intend to write hereafter, els you are like to go vnsuaded, and so running by your selfe alone, you may soone winne the game.

The remnant of this Division, I thinke not worth the answering, wherein you make sport with argumentes of your owne forging, and with this absurditie, as though I had said, that Christ had deliuered vs from the creatures of the worlde, which I say not, but from the Jewissh seruitude of elements, where the Institution or commandement of Christ maketh not these so necessary. I doubt not but the reader shal see as sufficiently confuted, and be satisfied, for ought that you say to the contrary, if he take the paynes, after that he hath read the wordes of your Replie. But to peruse againe with good aduise, what I haue said in my booke.

and so

FIN

The

The xij. Division.

BEcause M. Iewel findeth fault with the Masse specially for the single Communion, and for that the Priest doth Communicate alone: in my Answer I say, that the Priest doth not communicate alone, when he receiveth the Sacrament at Masse alone, but with al others that receive els where, though they be as touching place, neuer so farre distant. For the proufe of this in the xij. Division I allegé a saying of Cyrillus. who writeth, that our Lord blessing vs that beleue, with his owne body die through the mystical Cōmuniō maketh vs one body both with him selfe, and also between our selues. The Body of Christ in the Communion receiued, he calleth a meane deuised by our Lorde, wherby to vnite and ioine vs to God, and our selues one to another, though we be distant in bodie and soule. For this cause the Priest doth not Communicate alone. The cause then remoued for which M. Iewel repponeth the Masse, it remaineth, that he yelde & subscribe according to his promise. The whole place which in this Division is to be read more plainly and more at large, M. Iewel would faine auoide, if he wist how. The best spitt he could deuise, is this.

Iewel.

If M. Harding can proue that this same Cyrillus euer said priuately Masse, or in any of al his wvorkes once vsed the name of Masse, I wvill gladly yelde to the vvhole. But if Cyrillus neuer spake vvorde of the Masse, how is he here brought in to proue the Masse.

Harding.

why Sir beate you such malice to the Masse, that for y Masses sake, except I proue vnto you (and that so as your selfe wil alowe it to be sufficiently proued) which I beleue you neuer mind to do

Fol. 16. a.

Cyrillus.
lib. 11. in
Ioan. c. 26.The .101.
vnterstr.
Cyril. is
not here
brought in
specially to
proue the
Masse.

A Reioindre to

what so euer I bring) that Cyrillus said Masse, you will not
yelde to a point of true doctrine, auouched by many other fa-
thers besides? what reason haue you herein? what if you
and I varied about the doctrine of Baptisme, and I for con-
firmation of the Catholike faith therein alleged Cyrillus: would
you not yelde vnto it, onelesse I could proue, that hee in his
time ministred the Sacrament of Baptisme? As for the
name of the Masse, how absurde and foolish a thing is it, to re-
quire it to be shewed in the writings of Cyrillus, who wrote
not in Latine, but in Greke? But it is an easy thing for you to
mocke the ignorant, and by wordes to make shew of an answer,
when in dede you haue nothing reasonably to answer.

The com-
munion to-
geth vs to
gether,
though
we be in
 sundry
places.

Neither was Cyrillus brought in directly and chiefly for
proue of the Masse, but against the necessitie of the Communi-
cants comming together or being together in one place. whom,
though they be distant in body and soule, and therefore also in
place: yet Christ blessing them w his owne body through the
Ecclesiastical Communion (as Cyrillus saith) maketh one body both with
him selfe, & also betwen them selues. whereby it is proued the
Priest receiuing alone at the Masse, for which cause of Luther, it
was first called *private*, doth notwithstanding communicate with
others: And therefore the Masse is defended from that, for
which the Gospellers of these dayes, specially condemne it, inas-
much as the Priest though the people be not disposed to receiue
with him, doth not yet communicate alone.

You say, Iewel hauing a desire to reprove & deface al that I
say, be it neuer so true: and being loth I should seeme to your
disciples to say any thing in defence of the Masse, that were not
by you controlled: for colour of some maintenance of your glo-
rious Challenge, not being able otherwise to impugn the doc-
trine which in this place I confirmed by the auctoritie of the
auncient &

anuncient and learned byshop Cyrillus: you thought it þ best po-
licie, to make your Replie against þ truth by me auouched, with
an other truth. wherein you laye forth a thew of dysproue of
my sayinges and in dede dyspone them not at al. For a truth
can not be dysponed by an other truth, neither can one truth
tutte away an other.

As you procede, you take greate paines to proue, which no
man denyeth, that by faith wee are incorporate and made one
Body with Christ. Truth it is, through faith, Christ and we
are one Body mystical, he the head, we the members. This
is so wel knowen and so thowly agreed vpon, that there was
no neede, why you should vtter a sentence of your owne, and,
that it might be of better anchozitie, to father it vpon Cyrillus.
For where you say thus, Cyrillus saith that as many as beleue in Christ
whether they be sarre or neare, Iewes, or Gentiles, free or bond: they are
al one body in Christ Iesu: althoug this be true in it selfe, yet is it
false that Cyrillus saith so. For the words be yours and not his.

Likewise where you say, that Christ by the Sacrament of rege-
neration hath made vs flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, and im-
pute it vnto S. Chrysostome, though the saying be true in a
righte sence: yet is not that said by that holy father with the same
termes as you allege. You might be hoine withal for vsing
such libertie to the proufe of a truth, were not that you abuse it
often times to the proufe of sundry vttruses.

Forth you procede & bring in the wordes of Iaulinus, and of
S. Augustine witnessing þ by faith we are incorporate & ioyned
vnto Christ, which is not denyed. At length you come to vtter
those wordes, whereby you would confirme your Sacramentall
heresie, hauing intent to proue, þ we receiue not þ body of Christ
in the Eucharist verely and in dede, whereby we are vniued vnto
him according to the fleshy: but onely by faith and in sperte.

ad. I. I. I.
would dis-
sproue one
truth by
an other
truth,

Iewel,

In Epist.
ad Ephes.
Homil. 20.

In epist. 31.
ad August

A Reioindre to.

we are v-
nited and
ioyned vn-
to Chyſte
ij. wayes.
ſpiritually
onely; and
according
to the fleſh

Spiritual
vnitie.

Natural
& perſite
vnitie.

Cyri- in
loan. lib.
10. cap. 13.

Here this much is to be conſidered. That we be vnited and ioyned vnto Chyiſt, two wayes, ſpiritually or according to the ſpīrite onely; and according to the fleſh. This is of the fa- thers called, vnion, vnitie, coniunction, Communion, in cor- poration. Spiritually we are of the auncient and beſt learned fathers reported to be vnited, knitte, and ioyned together, by faith, by charitie, by wil, by grace, by obedience of Religion: this coniunction is named Spiritualis vnitas, Spiritual vnitie, or the vnitie of wil.

An other way we are ioyned and vnited vnto Chyiſte, as Cyillus and S. Hilary ſay, Secundum carnem, according to the fleſh; non habitudine ſolum, but alſo by natural participation. This vnitie or coniunction is of the fathers called a natural vni- tie, a perſite and conſummat vnitie: and the ſame is wrought by receiuing the fleſh of Chyiſte in the Myſtical Communion.

You M^r. Jewel do exclude the natural vnitie, and that co- iunction which we haue with Chyiſte according to the fleſh, and harpe onely vpon that ſtring, which ſoundeth altogether the ſpiritual vnitie. But ſith we are ioyned vnto Chyiſt, and made one Body with him, both Spiritually, and Corporally: you la- bour in vaine by prouſe of the one coniunction, to exclude the other.

We denie not (ſaith Cyillus, as beſore I haue alleged) that wee are ioined vnto Chyiſte ſpiritually by right faith, and ſincere Charitie: But that wee haue no coniunction with him after the fleſh, verely that wee denie vitterly, and ſaie, it is wide from the Scriptures. For prouſe hereof, heare Paule (ſaith he) ſaying: that al we be one Bodie in Chyiſte. For although wee be many, yet in him wee are one. For all wee take parte of one Breade. What troweth hee (hee meaneth the Arian Heretike) we knowe not the vertue of the Myſtical bleſſing

Mystical blessing? Which when it is in vs, doth it not cause, that Christe dwelleth in vs also corporally by the Communicating of Christes flesh? And there within a few wordes after, Our Sauour also saith he that eateth my flesh, & drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Wherof it is to be considered, that Christ is in vs not by inward or spirituall dispositiō only, but also by naturall participation. There he compareth the vniō and coniunction that is betwen Christe and vs through the communion, to the coniunction of sundry wares molten together and so mingled into one.

Of this vnitie and coniunction S. Hilary speaketh much in his eight booke de Trinitate. where hauing said that Christe is in vs by truth of nature, because in our Lordes meate we receiue verely the worde made flesh: He concludeth thus. Si verē igitur carnem &c. Then if Christe tooke to him the flesh of our body verely, and if that man, which was borne of Mary, be Christe verely, and we receiue the flesh of his body vnder the Myserie verely, and through this shalbe one thing, because the Father is in him, and he in vs: how is the vnitie of will auouched (by the Aris) where as the naturall proprietie through the Sacrament, is a Sacrament of perfite vnitie. There at large he proueth this vnitie and coniunction of vs with Christe, not to bee vnitie of will, or spirital only: but in dede, perfite, & according to nature, through the Mystical Communion. That I may vse the more breuitie here, I referre the reader to that eight booke de Trinitate, where S. Hilary speaketh more largely hereof.

As, that by faith and charitie we are incorporate and ioyned vnto Christe, I graunte and confesse: so that we be not also by an other meane incorporate and ioyned vnto him, and knitte together, as it were into one body: I denye. That other meane of

Ioan. 6.

Hilarius
de Trinitate
lib. 8.

The meane
of our

p 16

this

A Reioindre to

natural
and perfit
vnitie
God is
worthy
re
celing
of
Christs
body
into
our
bodies
in the
Com
munion.
In Ioan.
lib. 11. cap.
26.

this vnion, which the fathers in consideratiō of the further per
fection it is of, cal natural and perfiter is the worthy receiuing in
to our bodies of the body of Christ in the mysticall Communion.
That Christe (saith Cyrillus) might vnite euery one of vs within
our selues, and with God, although we are distant both in body &
soule: yet he hath deuised a meane cōuenable to the father, and to
his owne wisdom. And wilt thou knowe reader what this
meane is? There he sheweth saying, *Suo enim corpore cre
dentes per Communionem mysticam benedicens, & secum, & in
ter nos vnum nos corpus efficit.* For in that he blesteth them
which beleue with his own body through the mysticall Commu
nion, he maketh vs our body both with him selfe, and also be
twene our selues. This meane whereby this vnitie that we
speake of is wrought, is special: and is not vsed in that vnitie,
coniunction, or incorporation, which is spiritual onely. In dede
this presupposeth that. For except we be first spiritually vnited
vnto Christe by faith and charitie, the receiuing of his body in
mysticall Communion, shall further separate vs from Christ, frō
God, and from the Church Christes mysticall body, and be to our
condemnation, as S. Paule saith.

1. Cor. 11.

¶. Jeto.
laboureth
to dispo
ne our na
tural vni
ting with
Christ, by
proue of
our spiritu
al vniting,
e so to bea
re ouer
one truth
by another
truth.

¶. Jeto. then there is a double incorporation, vnion, and con
iunction of vs with Christe, and of vs with our selues, the one
spiritual onely, and the other natural, & according to the flesh, as
I haue now declared: ¶. Jeto. by the affirmation of the one
going about to induce the denial of the other, both vntrely, and
guilefully, besyde reason, besyde learning, besyde doctrine of the
fathers, besyde the scriptures. The better to proue the spiritual
vniting onely, and to denye the vniting according to the flesh, he
denieth the spiritual eating of Christes body, which we also con
fess: and denieth the corporall and real eating, yea any eating at
all with the seruice of the body. And therof saith thus,

Ieruel

10 7 100 00 1120 20 4 1000 Iewel.

Neither may we thinke that Christes body must grossely and bodily be receiued into our bodies.

Harding.

Syr, you vse craft to loyne these two wordes grossely and bodily together.

We receiue Christes body bodily, because we receiue it into our bodies, and that by the seruice of our mouth,

and therefore bodily, for els how coulde we receiue it into our bodies? But grossely we receiue it not, as the Sapharnaites

imagined, that is to say, so as we eate beeste of mutton by peeces meale from the shambles. First let vs see by what scripture, rea-

son, or fathers you proue, that we must not eate the body of Christe bodily, that is to say, by the seruice of the body. And then

shal you heare, what I can allege for the affirmatiue parte.

S. Cyprian saith, It is meate not for the belly, but for the myn-

de. And S. Augustinus saith, Crede & manducasti. Beleue in Christ, & thou hast eaten. And Cyrillus that is here alleged, is written thus against

the objections of Theodoritus. We do not mainteine the eating of a man, vncenetically drawing the myndes of the faithfull vnto grosse

and prophane imaginations: neither do we subtraite these thinges vnto mans fantasie, that be receiued onely by pure & tryed faith.

Therefore saith Athanasius. It is spiritual meate, and spiritually is digested in vs. This is Christe set forth vnto vs in that most holy Supper,

*not to be receiued with the mouth: for that as Cyrillus saith, ouer a grosse and profane imagination: but to be embraced with a pure and a single faith.

Harding.

Here you pretend to allege S. Cyprian, S. Augustinus, Cyrillus, S. Athanasius. And what so euer they say, it proueth not at all yon

not of the due Sacramental eating of Christes body with the mouth, but of the grosse eating of a man called in greke Anthropophagia.

The. 101.

Untruth.

we must

beleue

Christes

body is bo-

dy receiued

into

our bodies

as here it

is proued.

Ioan. 6.

The. 103.

Untruth.

S. Cy-

prilian saith

not so.

Cyprian.

de corni.

Domini.

De consec.

Dist. 2.

In quid.

The. 104.

Untruth.

That hor-

is no

true.

The. 105.

Untruth.

Cyrillus.

speareth

Q. Jew.
dorth attri-
bute a say-
ing to S.
Cyprian,
that is not
S. Cy-
prians.

erroneous doctrine, which is, that we must not eate the body of Christe bodily, to witte with our mouth, for so your selfe do expounde it. First S. Cyprian is falsly recited. In his Sermon de cena Domini, he hath not those wordes. And yet you haue alleged them vnder the name of S. Cyprian in y^e Sermon more, then once in your Replie, likewise they that patched together the Apologie, haue alleged it, as S. Cyprians. wherin what part you haue, you knowe. The more, the vntruer man you haue shewed your selfe to the worlde. Like it is, that touching this saying by you fasthered vpon S. Cyprian, you gaue to much credite to your note booke.

**Two wa-
ies of ea-
ting the bo-
dy of
Christe,
spirituall,
and sacra-
mentall.**

Q. Jew.
auoideth
one truth
by an o-
ther truth.

But if S. Cyprian had so said, as we chesse the sayinge to be true in a right sense: how could you therof conclude your purpose? If Christes body bee not receiued in the blessed Sacrament to thintent to fill the belly, but to feede the soule and body to immortallitie: wil you say therfore, it must not be receiued with our mouth, & with bodily seruice? By what Logique make you that argument good? Know you not that there be two wayes of eating the body of Christe, spirituall, and sacramental? As he is eaten spirituallly without the seruice of the body, so can he be eaten sacramentally otherwise the by the seruice of the body? Of those the one excludeth not the other, as the spirituall union of vs with Christe, excludeth not the natural union, or that which is according to the flesh. This kinde of argument and reasoning is very simple, where the affirmation of one truth, is brought to proue the denyal of an other truth. As if one would say, **Q. Jewel** is wel sene in colours of Rhetorique, ergo he is not profoundly sene in the science of Dialectic: you would reply, it were folly reasoned, for you might be wel sene in both, as sundry auncient Fathers haue ben. And if I would so argue, I dare say, besyde re- proue of the weake argument, you would shew your selfe angry with

with the whole tale, were ech part of it neuer so true.

As for S. Augustine, where he saith, *Crede, & manducasti*, *De conse-*
beleeue, and thou hast eaten: it proueth that eating of the flesh of *erat. dist.*
 Chyiste which is by spirite onely, to be without the seruice of the *2. vt quid.*
 body, which is not denyed. But that Chyistes flesh is not verely
 ly and really also eatē by the seruice of our body, vnder the forme
 of bread, it proueth not.

Concerning Cyillus, you haue alleged him vntuly, and *M. Jew.*
 farre otherwise then he wypte. So haue you falsified him to like *both falsly*
 euil purpose, you, or who so euer of your felowes was authoꝝ of *allege Cy-*
 the Apologie. The whole place maketh most directly against *rillus, and*
 your Sacramētarie doctrine, and against that which you would *corrupteth*
 here so sayne pꝛone. Because the opening of this whole point, *his sense.*
 and ful answerē vnto it, requireth many wordes, and I haue al-
 ready treated thereof sufficiently in my Confutation of the Apo-
 logic: I thinke it not good to repeat againe here, that I said
 there, but for answerē to direct the reader to that place. By good
 and due consyderation wherof, he shall vnderstand Cyillus to
 be wholly on our syde, and in that place specially most contrary
 to the Sacramentaries. If the reader being him selfe vnlarned,
 conferre with some learned man to attaine the better vnderstan-
 ding of that I haue said there touching this place of Cyillus: it
 shal not repent him. For it geueth great light to the further vnder-
 standing of this secrete Mysterie. Now these premisses ser-
 uing you to so litle purpose, your *Therefore saith Athanasius* with
 which you conclude, must nedes seme to be weake and of smal
 force.

It remaineth, that I allege somewhat for the affirmatiue
 part, that is to say, that the body of Chyiste is receiued of vs not
 onely by faith, but also bodily, by our mouth, and so by the seruice
 of our body. First, touching scripture, how say you sy, do we

In my
Confuta-
tion, fol.
108. a. & c.

A Reioindre to

Then the
body of
Christ is
eate of vs
bodily.

*De trinit.
lib. 8.*

not eate the body of Christ, as the Apostles did eate it: You deny
it not I am sure. Then how did they eate it at our Lordes sup-
per? Did they not eate it, as Christe bad them eate it? who deny-
eth? Then wheras Christe said after he had taken bread, and ge-
uen thanks, take ye, and eate ye, this is my body: Did they not
take it in their mouth and eate it? If you make faith the onely
meane, wherby our Lordes body is eaten, then was it not to be
despured with our Lordes hand. That which they did eat, they
receiued from our Lordes hand, and that which he bad them eate,
he gaue them with his hand. Now both our Lord hath professed
(as S. Hilarie saith) and we beleue the same to be his flesh in
dede: but that which is eaten by faith only, is spiritual, and what
is spiritual, it is neither geuen nor receiued with handes, but
with spirite: therfore the body of Christe was not eaten of the A-
postles, with spirite or faith only; but also with their mouthes,
and with the seruice of their bodies.

*Testimonies of the Fathers, for the bodily eating
of the body of Christe.*

*Irenaeus.
lib. 4. cap.
34.*

Lib. 5.

But let vs see whether the fathers haue acknowledged Chri-
stes body to be eaten bodily, and with the seruice of our body,
and not by faith only. S. Irenaeus saith; Quomodo dicunt car-
nem in corruptionem deuenire, & non percipere vitam, quae à
corpore & sanguine dominialitur? How say they that the flesh
commeth into corruption, and taketh not life, which is fed with
the body and bloud of our Lord? Again in an other place, How
do they deny (saith he) the flesh to be of capacitie to receiue the
gift of God, that is life euerlasting, which is nourished with the
bloud and body of Christe?

*Tertullian.
lib. de re-
surrectio-
ne carnis.*

Tertullians wordes be plaine. Caro corpore & sanguine
Christi vescitur, vt anima de Deo saginetur. The flesh eateth the
flesh & bloud of Christ, that the soule may be fed of God. Let
us,

St. Iewel shew vs, how the flesh eateth without a mouth.

Here haue we plaine testimonies, & the flesh of man is fed & nourished with the body and blood of Christ, & that our flesh eateth the body and blood of Christ. If these fathers had said, that man eateth the body or flesh of Christ, perhaps St. Iewel wold haue made an only spiritual eating of it: now that they say it of the flesh, it cannot be vnderstanded so as the bodily eating, or eating with the mouth, be utterly excluded.

Our flesh
eateth the
flesh of
Christ.

S. Cyprian speaking of certaine, who had in time of persecution denyed Christ, & had eaten of thinges that were offered to Idols, & yet presumed to come vnto our Lordes table: saith, plus modò in Dominù manibus atq; ore delinquant, q̄ cum Dominù negauerunt. They synne moze now against our Lord w hands & mouth, then when they denied our Lord. How could S. Cyprian seme truly to haue vttered this saying, except y body of our Lord were in dede receiued with handes, and eaten with the mouth?

Histo. tri-
part. lib. 9.
cap. 30.
August. ad
Ianuariu
epist. 113.
Cyprian.
Serm. 5. de
lapsis.

S. Chrysostome maketh mention of taking Christes body with our handes, and with our mouth in sundry Homilies.

Homil. 82.

How wilt thou receiue the holy body of our Lord with such handes, saith S. Ambrose to Theodosius the Emperour, Quare meritate ore tuo poculum sanguinis pretiosi percipies? with what temeritie wilt thou receiue with thy mouth the cuppe of the pretious blood? It hath pleased the holy Ghost (saith S. Augustin) that for the honor of so great a Sacramēt our Lordes body should enter into the mouth of a Christen man, before common meates.

Et. 83. in
Mat. &
24. in. 1. ad
Corinth.
Et 60. ad
popul.
Leo de ie-
iunio. 7.

Ye ought so to Communicate of the holy table, saith S. Leo, that ye be out of al doubt touching the truth of Christes body and blood. Hoc enim ore sumitur, quod fide creditur. For that thing is receiued with the mouth, which is with faith beleued. No testimonies might easily be alleged out of the fathers so prouue hereof, were not these sufficient in a matter so manifest & certain.

mensis.
Serm. 6.
That this
is receiued
with the
mouth,
which is
beleued
with faith

A Reioindre to

Thus it is proued, that our Lordes body is receiued and eaten with the mouth, and not by faith only, as M^r. Jewel audiether, making much therein for the blasphemous heresie of the Arians.

This much being sufficient for answer to the chiefe pointes of this Diuision, passing ouer the rest, which is but mater impertinent, forged argumentes attributed to me after his common custome, misconstraining of Doctours, thwarting, wrāgling, and drawing of the plaine and most true saying of Cyrillus to a pretended proufe of Iprivate Masse specially, which was by me alleged against the necessitie of condition of place: Let vs now come to his. 14. Diuision.

The.xiiij. Diuision.

Here M^r. Jewel, as commonly otherwheres, sinckereth a syde quite from the mater, and sheweth him selfe offended with certaine wordes of myne, which I inserted into a sentence by way of a Parenthesis. In those wordes he is noted to haue made a pceuisly argument of the vse of Excommunication, and with certaine other childish reasons of that sort, to haue scoffed at some Catholike wryters.

Touching the reproch of scoffing, his answer is, that he vsed the pulpite, as a place forsooth of reuerence, and not of scoffing. But how truly his reuerence hath therof discharged him selfe, I repute me to his owne vnreuerent Sermon extant in print. which to euery indifferent iudge shalbe a testimonie both of his vanitie in making that proude Challenge, and of his scurrilitie in uttering such stoe of scoffes. His pceuisly argument made of the vse of Excommunication, wherein he thought the high estimation of his learning to be touched, he defendeth thus,

Ieruel.

level.

Further touching Excommunication, I said thus. If the priest that saith Masse in Louaine, may communicate vvith the priest that saith Masse in Calicut, vvhich is M. Hardinges greatest grounde for his priuate Masse: then hath the Church so farre forth as toucheth the priestes, lost the vvhole vse of Excommunication. For the partie excommunicate being a priest, *might say, he vvould say Masse, and so receiue the Communion, euen vvith the bishop of vvhom he vvere Excommunicate, vvwhether he vvould or no. This saying hath M. Harding condemned for peeuish, by his authoritie on- ly, not by reason.

Harding.

Sy: you haue somewhat altered the wordes to your aduā- tage, and yet is your argument as peeuish as befoze. The same may thus be truly framed. An Excommunicate priest may say, he wil say Masse, and so receiue the Communion euen vvith the bishop that Excommunicated him, vvwhether he wil or no. Ergo, the Church so farre forth as concerneth priestes, hath lost the vvhole vse of Excommunication. I appeale to your owne Lo- gique M. Jewel, vvwhether this argument be not very peenish: neither are the peeces of it vvhole, nor hang they one of an other. For vvhat if the priest may say, he wil say Masse, and so receiue the Communion vvith his bishop, vvwhether he wil or no: shal it folow of that his saying, that the Church hath lost the vse of Ex- communication? Can one priestes vndue saying, depprue the Church of that due auctoritie? Verely the Church of Christ vvwere a fickle and fraile thing, if vvith so light a blast of vvinde, her po- vvwer so great and so vvweighty, vvwere dissolued and broken.

Besides this, your antecedent is false. For the priest vvvhich is duly Excommunicate, may not say, that he wil say Masse, and so receiue the Communion vvith the bishop, vvwhether he wil or no. For that may he say only, vvvhich he may iustly say. And iustly he can not say it, for a priest Excommunicate is forbidden

The. 106
vntruth.
That mi-
ght he not
say, be-
cause he
might not
lawfully
say it, for
so he might
not law-
fully do,
being exco-
municate.

A Reioindre to

to say Masse: therefore he may not so say at al.

If you causi and wangle, replying, that he may so say, and also say Masse, because he is not excluded from it by case of impossibilitie: I answer, he is utterly and simply excluded from possibilitie of possibilitie lawfully and duly to say Masse, the band of Excommunication not being loosed: Otherwise he may say Masse so, as a man may steale, kil, and commit aduoutrie, who of God so to do is suffered. But then he saith it to his further damnation.

Q. Ieso. falsifieth the whole state of the mater by changing communicating into receiuing. But Syr how conueigh you in this much, and so (he might) receiue the Communion vvith the bishop? I spake of communicating, and you falsitie the whole state of our mater, by turning communicating, into receiuing the Communion, I said of the Priest saying Masse alone, and at his Masse worthily receiuing the Sacrament alone, that he doth not communicate alone, but vvith other Chyristen folke worthily receiuing in other places. You pretend, as though I said, that receiuing the Sacrament alone, he receiued the Communion vvith others, which word of receiuing vvith others, importeth the act done in one place. which I say not. For that were absurd: because receiuing of the Communion together of many, requirerth the being together of many in one place. But that many Communicate together, it is not of absolute necessitie, that they be together in one place.

I diuersitie between receiuing together, and communicating together. For the better vnderstanding of this point, this is that I meane. It is not one thing to receiue the Communion together, and to communicate together. For receiuing together doth determinate the identitie of the receiuers time and place. Communicating together, doth determinate the identitie of the thing, by diuersie receiued, and also of the receiuers. The first is called of S. Chrysostome commonly *Μετοχή* or *μετοχή*, the second *κοινωνία*. Now as the outward acte of receiuing together is not done, but by them that be in time and place together, so the thing

receined being one and the selfe same in sundry places, may be of many and diuers, enioyed together, though they be in distinct times and places. when mention is made of receiuing together, then this worde *together* determineth the outward act of receiuing, but when mention is made of Communicating together, the worde *together* hath respect to the thing receined, to wit, the body of Christ: which being one, and the selfe same, in al that receiue it, maketh al the worthy receiuers to be one with it selfe, and within them selues.

Thus the ther is ods betwen these two, to receiue & communion being ment thereby the body of Christ, & to communicate. The good & worthy only do communicate in this sense, & we vnderstand thereby the receiuers to be made one wth Christ, the euil may receiue, though so they communicate not. As Judas receined the communion with & Apostles, but he did not (in this sense) communicate, that is to say he was not incorporate & vnited to Christ, he did not enter into the common grace & benefite purchased by & death of & body of Christ wth the rest of & Apostles. & so may your excommunicate priest say Masse, & receiue the communion, & is, the body of Christ, (though not wth the bishop of w^h he is excommunicat, as you say, for what bishop wil suffer an excommunicate person to receiue wth him) but the vnworthily & wickedly he saith & receiue against al order, & without & feare of God, & to his condemnation. It is not inough for him & is excommunicate to say, & he wil say Masse, & communicate with any whether he wil or no: he must first be absolved, and then being disposed & duly proued, he may say Masse, receiue the Sacrament and communicate: els not. For els the true flesh and blood of Christ may be receined of him, and be in him, but how? as S. Gregorie saith, *essentia, non salubri efficientia*, in substance, not with holisom working.

Dialog.
lib. 4.

Thus the excommunicate priest though he say Masse neuer so much, wel may he receiue the very body of Christ in substance,

A Reioindre to

the helthful grace thereof whereby he might Communicate with Christe, and with the Church, so as he be made a member of that mystical body, and one with Christe: he receiveth not. And notwithstanding that his private presumption, if he be so desperate as to say Masse, and receive the blessed Sacrament: yet is not the Church in danger to lose the whole vse of Excommunication, which M. Jewels peevishly argument falsly concludeth. And so for al his logique, rhetorique, or divinitie, he hath not yet proved the contrary, but that a Priest which saith Masse at Louaine, or Sarisburie, doth Communicate with a nother catholike priest that saith Masse in Calicute.

How wel M. Jewel stode in his owne conceit for the demise of this argument, it appeareth by that he singeth the same song agayne, where he saith at his conclusion thus.

Iewel.

Thc. 107. Now if M. Hardinges * principle stand for good, that the priest say-
vntruth. ing his private Masse, may receive the Communion vvith al others in other
It is not places, that do the like: then can no priest be excommunicate. For not vvith-
my princi- standing neither any other priest, nor any of the people vvill receive vvith
ple. I say him, yet may he say a Priuate Masse, and by M. Hardinges nevy deuise
 not he may receive the straight vvay communicate vvith them al.
receiue the
Communi-
nion with
others.

Harding.

M. Jew. what nedeth this an answer being answered already? Yet
falsifieth this much may I say. It is an euident signe, that you are ouer-
my wordes come by force of truth, and yet wil not geue ouer for worldly
 shame. For not hauing what to say against that I say in dede,
 you sayne me to say that I say not, that you may seme to gaine-
 say me. I tel you once againe, it is not my principle, neither wil
 I haue it stand for good, that the priest saying his private Masse
 as you terme it, may receive the Communion vvith al others in
 other places, that do the like. Read my wordes againe, though
 it be greuous vnto you so to be founde a falsifier, I speake nei-
 ther

ther of private Masse, as who in dede acknowledge no Masse to be private, nor of receiving the Communion with al others in other places. which implieth an absurditie, and impossibilitie. For can the Priest or any person receive the Communion with al others in other places? Doth not the receiving of one with others presuppose their being together in a place? For els how doth one receive with an other? Now as al others besides some one person can not be together in one place, so neither is it possible, nor reasonably said, that one man may receive the Communion with al others of other places; that do the like. For as receiving signifieth the outward act of Participation, and requireth a being together of the receivers in one place, so can al others never receive together with the Priest. So many as be baptised do Communicate together in Baptisme, yet do they not receive Baptisme together. So al Communicants together of our Lodes Body, but actually and outwardly they receive not together.

The xv. Division.

Having saide before, that one may Communicate with
an other, though they be in distinct places, and that it
was thought lausful, and so used in ^{the} Primitive Church,
in this. xv. Division I beginne to rehearse ancient testimonies
for the same. First I recite S. Irenens alleged by Eusebius,
who writing to S. Victor Bishop of Rome, sheweth how the
Bishops of that See used to sende the Sacrament to Bishops
that came from foyeine partes to Rome. Thintene thereof
was.

A Reioindre to

Fol. 16.b

was, that by receiuing the Communion their agreeing, consent together, and vniue might be protested and signified. S. Irenaus wordes be there alleged. For witte of which, & for the whole processe, I send the diligent Reader to the place of my booke. By which wordes it appeareth, that bishops communing from Asia to atome, and the Bishops of that See, did communicate together before their persons met together in one place.

If this be granted, as by good witnesse it appeareth to be so be granted: therat it foloweth: the Masse is not vniuersall, wherat it is receiued: & Channells also, for which these Soppellers do condemn the Masse: such notwithstanding he doth communicate with others, that receiue in other places.

¶ Jewel hauing little to say hereto, before he come to the matter, setteth as it were a great flourish, as Maisters of Fence be wont to doo, before they play in good earnest. In this flourish, hee letteth see at holy and Blessed Martyrs freely. Of the East and West Churches diuersitie in keeping Easter daye grev contention (saith he) and the matter brake out into cruel beates. Victor was on the one side, and Polycarpus on the other side. I thinke hee would haue said, if his memorie hadde not failed, Anicetus and Polycarpus: for the other twoo liued in sundrye ages.

S. Victor by him was a man (forsooth) of a fierie nature. S. Irenaus wrote vnto him a sharpe letter, and handled him very roughly, and used not his stile of Superiarietie, but called him and other bishops of Rome before him, by the name of Priestles. At length after a sort of blowes thus being at the most blessed Martyrs whereby to hurie their estimation in the conceit of ignorant Readers: he commeth to the matter, where he is as cold in answering the point, as he was in his extravagantes hore to set Saints at debate and strife. There he saith thus.

Jewel

But to the matter, these Bishops (saith M. Harding) communicated together

¶ Jewels flourish before he come to play in earnest.

¶ Jewel

together before they mette. If he meane in faith and Religion, it is not denied. If in the use of the Sacramentes, it is not proved.

Harding.
By my meaning is, not only that they agreed in one faith and Religion, but that they communicated together in the ecclesiastical and Sacramental Communion, the one by sending, the other by receiving the Sacrament, in which was the Body of Christ under the forme of Bread. I meane the holy Eucharist, for so Irenaeus calleth it. I speake plaine, what craft you meane by the use of the Sacramentes, as you terme it, I knowe not. Eucha-ristia.

But you say it is not proved. To a contentious man it is hard to prove any thing, be it never so true and plaine, when he is disposed to wrangle. S. Irenaeus saith, the Bishops of Rome sent the Eucharist or Sacrament to the Bishoppes that came from the Churches of Asia. To what purpose, but that it should be received? And by that receiving the party that came from Asia communicated with the Pope, and signified him selfe thereby to agree with him in faith and Religion. For so to communicate together, it was not of necessity, that the one should come, and be at the others elbow.

Iewel.
In my iudgement this worde Eucharistia, in this place of Irenaeus, signifieth not the sacrament already consecrate, but rather other common bread, wherewith our Bishop used them to present an other, as with a special token of consent in Religion and Christian concords: which bread the receiver afterward if he thought it good, might use at the holy ministration. In that sense is somewhat Paulinus wrote unto S. Augustine, Panem unum, &c.

Paulinus
ad Aug.
Epist. 35.

Harding.
Be that belongeth not the wordes of our Saviour, Hoc est corpus

A Reioindre to

Ad. Iew=
els vaine
Gheasse.

corpus meum; will not beleue that the words Eucharist, signifi-
eth the Sacrament. *Ray* *Ad. Iewel* your p̄uate iudgement,
or more properly to speake, your fancy is to light, & your gheasse
to vaine, thus to make of the blessed Sacrament in S. Irenæus,
none other but common bread sent for a present. Such presentes
were in olde time called Eulogiz, and Benedictiones, but that
they were euer called by the name of Eucharistia, which is the
special name of the blessed Sacrament, you shal neuer be able to
proue. Neither were they sent, to thintent they should be conse-
crated, as your conjecture is, for the loanes & S. Paulinus sent to

Paulinus
epist. 36. ad
Roman.
inter epist.
August.

Epist. 35.
& 36.
Dist. 13. c.
de eulogijs

Paulinus
epist. 31.
Paulinus
epist. 1. ad
Seuerū in
ter epist.
Paulini.

Licentius a yong man not yet Priest, shal some control & iudge-
ment. Neither were such blessings, giftes, or presents, made of
bread only, wherof mentio is in certain epistles of S. Paulinus,
one to Alipius, an other to Romanianus, which you or he & ga-
thered your notes for you report to haue ben writte to S. Augu-
stine: but also of other things, though specially of such wherby
mā is fed: As it appeareth by & we read in Gratian, where it is
reported by Leo quartus, & the Fathers had determined nothing
concerning blessings or presens to be brought vnto synodes: least
the same might be an occasiō to Priests to withholden them selues
from cōming vnto them, & they might not be put to charge. And
S. Paulinus sent to Seuerus, not only Panem Campanū, Bread of
Campania, where he was Bishop, but also a dish of Bore.

Merely S. Irenæus directeth his words to this end, to shew &
the Bishops of Rome who were before S. Victor, ioined them-
selues in ecclesiastical & Sacramental Communiō to the bishops of
Asia, notwithstanding they held an other opiniō concerning the kee-
ping of Easter, then & Church of Rome had. Now the ecclesia-
cal Communion is not made, nor is thought it can be made
by any kinde of curtesie or humanitie, but by the Participation
of the Body of Christe. For it may bee, that Presentes of
common

common bread be sent from one to an other in token of friendship by such, as be not of one Communion. And as now the manner is to signifie loue and good wil by presenting wine, whē it happeneth frēdes to be neare: so in olde time the Fatherz used to send presentes of bread made in cakes or loaves one to an other, whē they were farre asunder, as it appeareth by the example of S. Paulinus and S. Augustine, who lyued the one at Rola in Italie, the other at Hippo in Afrike. And in very deede bread of his nature is such a thing, as conteineeth in it a certaine resemblance, signe, and token of vnitie, not only of ecclesiastical vnitie, which can not be but only betwene the members of the Church, but also of a certaine humane and ciuile conuinitie, which is wont to be common both to good and euil.

Againe this maketh specially against M. Jewels gheasse of common bread, that this name Eucharistia, which S. Irenæus here expresseth, is neuer used in the Fathers to be attributed vnto any bread, but only vnto the bread that is consecrated into the body of our Lorde. As for other breads how so euer they were halowed (as that bread which in olde time was distributed vnto the Catechumens, and among the faithfull people when they receined not the Communion, wherof S. Augustine speaketh) how so euer they were holy and consecrated, yet they neuer obteyned the name of the holy Eucharist. To conclude, we can not admytte this light gleasse of M. Jewel, vnlesse we wil also admytte the collection and reason which S. Irenæus used to perswade S. Victor to vnitie, to be not only vaine, but also ridiculous.

After many gheasses vttered to this ende, that Eucharistia in the place of S. Irenæus might not be taken for the Sacrament, he cometh to his accustomed railing and scoffing. And for same to performe the better, he sayeth as his manner is, an argument of his owne, & maketh gay spoys at it, as if it were mine.

A Reioindre to

Ieruel.

This thing being graunted, that Eucharistia in this place of Irenæus be taken for the Sacrament, let vs now see M. Hardinges reasons.

The Bishop of Rome saith he sent the Sacrament vnto them, that came out of Asia: Ergo there was priuate Masse.

This conclusion is farre sette, and hangeth loosely. For I might demaund, vvhich then of the three said Masse? He that sent the Sacrament, or he that receiued it, or els the Messenger that brought it? It were a straunge matter to see a Masse, and yet no man to say Masse.

Harding.

I allege
S. Ire-
neus for
proue of
Commu-
nion among
them that
were in dis-
tinct pla-
ces: S. Ier-
uel. for
answer
sheweth at
the Masse

Wel scoffed. Make as good sport as it liketh your merry head, you scoffe at your owne selfe, not at me. For the argument is yours, it is not myne. That place is not alleged for priuate Masse, as you know well ynough, but for Communion among them that be in distinct places. Why scoffe you beside the purpose? Your pastime loseth his grace, for that it lighteth vpon no person. For no man hath so reasoned. You shewe your selfe to haue a merry grace in playing a merry wises parte, but pittie it is, the matter is not fitte for your sporting head.

Ieruel.

Verely Irenæus hath not one woorde neither of the communion, nor of the Masse: onlesse M. Harding wil say, that mittere, is Latine to communicate, or mittere Eucharistiam, is Latine to say Masse.

Harding.

The worde of S. Irenæus is, ἐπιτροπὴν τῆς εὐχαριστίας, mittebant Eucharistiam, they sent the Sacrament. To what intent but to be receiued? Kuffinus that turned Eusebius Ecclesiastical stoppe into Latine, who lyued in S. Hieromes time, and hath ben alwayes take for a learned man, semeth to take the place for this blessed Sacrament, in that he made translation of it thus, solenniter transmittēbant, the Bishops of Rome sent them that came from Asia.

Asia, the Sacrament solemnely, or with solemnitie. That a loafe of common bread should be sent with solemnitie, it hath no shew of reason. Now if it were not sent to be receiued, whereby a Communion is proued, then shew vs to what other ende it was sent.

Jewel.

If it were common bread, then was it but a present. If it were the Sacrament, then was it to be receiued, not streight vpon the way, or perhaps late in the night, or in the Inne at the common table among other meates: but after ward at his pleasure in his Congregation.

Harding.

Is this the last wist you haue M. Jewel? How many holes wil you hide your selfe in like a foxe, rather then you wil be take? Common bread is neuer in the auncient Fathers called Eucharistia. It was the Sacrament, how loth are you to confesse it? But it was not to be receiued say you, streight vpon the way, or late in the night, or in the Inne at the Common table among other meates. who saith, that so it was to be receiued? could you not appoint him, if it liked you, a more conuenient time and place, then late in the night, and the Common table among other meates? why might he not receiue it in a Church, chapel, or in his chamber, kneeling on his knees, lifting vp pure handes vnto God, before he went to feede on Common meates, in presence of the priest or deacon that brought it, to the intent he might be a witness to the dooe of his receiuing?

And what meane you by his Congregation? Did euery Bishop in the primitive Church, when his Church had neither welth nor peace, bring his Congregation with him to Rome from Asia, that he might not receiue the Sacrament alone? You had rather (I see wel) make a fowle wist, then no wist at all. But how little al this serueth your turne, who perceiueth not that hath reason?

Jewel.

A Reioindre to

Iewel.

But immediately after foloweth a manifest mention, in vvhhat order the Bishops vsed then to communicate together: vvhich thing M. Harding thought better to dissemble. Cum res ita haberent, communicabant

The. 108. inter se mutuo, & in Ecclesia Anicetus concessit Eucharistiā Polycarpo. The matters betwixen them standing thus, they communicated together: and Anicetus in the Church graunted the Sacrament, or the ministracion of the Sacrament vnto Polycarpus.

Here marke good Christian reader, then they communicated, *saith Irenaeus, vvhhen they mette in the Church, and not before they mette together, as M. Harding saith. Anicetus, as Irenaeus saith, receiued the Sacrament vvvith Polycarpus in the Church: and not as M. *Harding seemeth to say, in his Inne or hosterie. Nowv the truth of the matter stāding thus, vvhāt hath M. Harding here founde for his priuate Masse?

The. 110. **Untruth.** Neither he. **Untruth.** Harding.

A neither say it, nor seeme to say it. For Anicetus could not be thought to haue gone from his own house at Rome, vnto an Inne or hosterie for that purpose. To communicate is one, & to receiue Communion is not al one thing. **M. Jewel** falsifieth **S. Irenaeus.** **M. Jewel** here requireth thee good Christian reader to marke, so require I thee also to marke, and that with al diligence. For if thou do not, thou maist easily be deceived. It is not altogether one thing (as I haue said before) a man to communicate with an other, and to receiue the Communion with an other, that is, outwardly to receiue the Sacrament in the same place with an other. A man may communicate with an other being distinct in place. They that receiue the Sacrament by Communion outwardly together, must be together in one place. **M. Jewel** by changing these wordes one in an others place, belyeth mee, and begyleth thee, and falsifieth the holy Fathers saying.

This much is reported by **S. Irenaeus** in the Epistle that he wrote to **S. Victor**, exhorting him by the example of holy fathers, to deale mercifully with them of Asia; and not to excommunicate them for keeping Easter vpon an other day, then it was kept in the Church of Rome. Whē blessed Polycarpus (saith he) came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, they varied a litle about some

some other things, and also for this point of keeping Easterday: yet they kept peace, and would not fall out one with the other in no wise. For neither could Anicetus perswade Polycarpus to leave that, which he had observed following S. Iohn, and other Apostles: neither could Polycarpus perswade Anicetus to depart from the custome of his forefathers bishops of Rome.

Now follow the wordes in S. Irenæus, whereby it might appear, that notwithstanding this diversity of mynides, they were at peace and united one with another. καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἔχόντων, ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς. That is to say, these matters standing thus, they communicated the one with the other. Whether they received the Sacrament together in one place, or communicated before they mette together: by the Greke phrase it can not without probable gainsaying be determined. And here maketh the Greke a full sense, and endeth one parte of the sentence. So here have we a Communion between these two holy Bishops.

Immediately followeth an other parte of the Periodus, as if it were a new sentence. It is this. καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρέχοντο ὁ Ἀνίκης τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ πολυκάρπῳ καὶ ἐντροπῇ δηλονότι. Atq; in ecclesia concessit Anicetus Eucharistiam Polycarpo honoris causa. As much to say in English. And in the Church, Anicetus yielded unto Polycarpus for honors sake, the Eucharist, or the doing of the priestly office, for so it may rather signifie here, and so hath Ruffinus turned it, Sacerdotali ministerio perfungi. And to do the priestly office, what els was it, but to consecrate, offer, receive, and to deliver the Communion, if others were disposed to receive, which is that we call Mass: whether in the Church S. Polycarpus ministered the Communion to S. Anicetus or no, I define nothing. These wordes force it not. If M. Jewel were driven to prove it, as he boldly affirmeth it: for al his shifts he should leave it uncertaine.

A Reioindre to

Iewel.

But immediately after foloweth a manifest mention, in vvhhat order the Bishops vsed then to communicate together: vvhich thing M. Harding thought better to dissemble. Cum res ita haberent, communicabant

The. 108. inter se mutuo, & in Ecclesia Anicetus concessit Eucharistiā Polycarpo. **Untruth.** The matters betwixen them standing thus, they communicated together: and Anicetus in the Church graunted the Sacrament, or the ministracion of the Sacrament vnto Polycarpus.

Here marke good Christian reader, then they communicated, *saith Irenew, vvhien they mette in the Church, and not before they mette together, as M. Harding saith. Anicetus, as Irenew *saith, receiued the Sacrament vvvith Polycarpus in the Church: and not as M. *Harding semeth to say, in his Inne or hosterie. Nowv the truth of the matter stāding thus, vvhath **The. 109.** bath M. Harding here founde for his priuate Masse? **Untruth.**

A. neither say it, nor seeme to say it. For Anicetus could not be thought to haue gone from his own house at Rome, vnto an Inne or hosterie for that purpose. To communicate with one, & to receiue Communion is not al one thing. **M. Jewel** here requireth thee good Christian reader to marke, so require I thee also to marke, and that with al diligence. For if thou do not, thou maist easily be deceiued. It is not altogether one thing (as I haue said before) a man to communicate with an other, and to receiue the Communion with an other, that is, outwardly to receiue the Sacrament in the same place with an other. A man may communicate with an other being distinct in place. They that receiue the Sacrament of Communion outwardly together, must be together in one place. **M. Jewel** by changing these wordes one in an others place, begyleth mee, and falsifieth thee, and falsifieth the holy Fathers saying.

This much is reported by S. Irenew in the Epistle that he wrote to S. Victor, exhorting him by the example of holy fathers, to deale mercifully with them of Asia; and not to excommunicate them for keeping Easter vpon an other day, then it was kept in the Church of Rome. Whē blessed Polycarpus (saith he) came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, they varied a litle about some

some other things, and also for this point of keeping Easterday: yet they kept peace, and would not fall out one with the other in no wise. For neither could Anicetus perswade Polycarpus to leave that, which he had observed following S. Iohn, and other Apostles: neither could Polycarpus perswade Anicetus to depart from the custome of his forefathers bishops of Rome.

Now follow the wordes in S. Irenæus, whereby it might appeare, that notwithstanding this diversitye of myndes, they were at peace and united one with another. καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἔχοντων, ἐκοινωνήσαν ἑαυτοῖς. That is to say, these matters standing thus, they communicated the one with the other. whether they received the Sacrament together in one place, or communicated before they mette together: by the Greke phrase it can not without probable gainesaying be determined. And here maketh the Greke a full sense, and endeth one parte of the sentence. So here have we a Communion between these two holy Bishops.

Immediately followeth an other parte of the Periodus, as if it were a newe sentence. It is this. καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρέχουσιν ὁ Ανίκητος τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τῷ πολυκάρπῳ κατ' ἐντροπὴν δηλονότι. Atq; in ecclesia concessit Anicetus Eucharistiam Polycarpo honoris causa. As much to say in English. And in the Church, Anicetus yielded unto Polycarpus for honors sake, the Eucharist, or the doing of the priestly office, so; so it may rather signifie here, and so hath Rufinus turned it, Sacerdotali ministerio perfungi. And to do the priestly office, what els was it, but to consecrate, offer, receive, and to deliver the Communion, if others were disposed to receive, which is that we call Masse: whether in the Church S. Polycarpus ministered the Communion to S. Anicetus or no, I define nothing. These wordes force it not. If M. Jewel were bypoken to prove it, as he boldly affirmeth it: so; all his shiftes he should leave it uncertaine.

A Reioindre to

who so euer duly examineth this place, and considereth the order of the wordes, can not but iudge they communicated together, befoze they met at Church. Els how can he excuse S. Irenæus of vsing a preposterous order? For these wordes, *καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, (that is to say, and in the Church) geue the reader to vnderstand an other thing donne befoze.

And though it were graunted, that S. Polycarpus ministred the Sacrament to þ blessed Pope S. Anicetus, yet wherof wil it appeare, that ther was a number of others to receiue besides? If none receiued but the two Bishops, how stādeth it with M. Jewels doctrine to allow it for a lawfull Communion, sith that the booke of common prayers to be vled in the Congregacions of England acknowledgeth none for a sufficient Communion, onlesse there be thye to receiue with the Minister at least, be the parrish neyer so little? And the order of the Primitive church seemeth to require, that al the people should receiue, or depart the Church.

where you say then M. Jewel, and wil the reader to marke it, then they communicated, saith Irenæus, vwhen they met in the Church: there is one vnttruth, for Irenæus saith not so, as I haue now declared. Againe. S. Irenæus speaketh those wordes of the special case of S. Polycarpe: And my wordes are spokē in general of the bishops of Asia that came to Rome. wherfoze your Replie is not aptly applied to the purpose. And it appereth that S. Polycarpe was receiued of Pope Anicetus with a more special priuilege of honoz for his singular worthinesse, then other Bishops of Asia of lesse estimation were of other Popes.

Furthermoze where you say, Anicetus, as Irenæus saith, receiued the Sacrament vvith Polycarpus in the Church: and not as M. Harding semeth to say, in his Inne or hosterie: there be two vnttruthes at once. For neither saith S. Irenæus the one, nor I þ other. And though

I might say, that S. Anicetus communicated with S. Polycarpus befoze they met together in one place, for asmuch as the one sent the Sacrament, and the other receiued it: yet that S. Anicetus receiued the Sacrament with S. Polycarpus, specially in an Inne or hosterie: I do not so much as seme to say it. Were you deceiue the reader by vsing the worde receiuing the Sacrament together, for communicating together.

Now the truth of the matter standing thus, what hath M. Jewel here founde against the Masse? whereas I on the other side prouing a Communion to be betwene men that be in distinct places, haue proued the Masse for þe cause is not to be condēned for the Priestes sole receiuing. Because notwithstanding, he may at the same time Communicate with others, that worthily receiue in other places.

The xvi. Diuision.

Here I continue to confirme that I went about to proue befoze, that many may communicate together, who be not in one place together. For witnesse and proufe hereof as in the diuision, which M. Jewel maketh befoze this, I alleged S. Irenæus writing to S. Victor: so here I allege the known place of S. Iustine the Martyr in his second Apologie. where he declareth, how in his time, after that the Seruice was done, and the people had ben houseled in the common place of prayer: the Deacons caried the Sacrament to them þe were absent, to the intent they should also be partakers and Communicate with the rest, as if they had not ben letted frō being in the same selfe place with them, by sicknesse, busynesse, or by some other occasion.

who doubtlesse if they might not haue communicated with them, because they remained at home in their houses, and were

In the primitive Church, some were thought to communicate together that were not in one place together.

A Reioindre to

absent from the companie of the rest gathered together in place of prayer: the Deacons had not ben commaunded to beare the Sacrament vnto them. For it should haue ben said, as M. Jewel now saith, it is no Communion, onlesse the partie that receiveth, haue a companie to receiue with him in the same place: Item, it is the Institution of Christs, that many Communicate together, and that none receiue alone. Hereof it foloweth, that in the Primitive church they were thought to communicate together, who were in distinct places, and so to do was iudged to be no breach of Christs Institution. If there were a communion then betwen them notwithstanding the distinction of places, why may not the Priest now also be thought to Communicate with others that receiue in other places, when at his Masse they that be present, be not prepared to receiue with him? Thus it is euident, the priest at Masse doth not communicate alone, for which these great Gospellers stoyne so much at the Masse, and nedes wil cal it private, whereas in dede the Masse it selfe in respect of the Sacrifice is not, ne can not be private, though the receiuing of the Sacrament, be sole or private. So that it ought not to be called private Masse, but this act of receiuing may be called private receiuing, for which the Masse is not made unlawful.

Read who will, the Replie of M. Jewel vnto this place of S. Iustine, And he shal fynde in effect nothing answered against the purpose, for which it was chiefly aleged: which was to proue, that some may communicate together, that be not in the same selfe place together. M. Jewel here pretendeth, as euery where els almost through this Article, that I haue brought this place for private Masse. And if of euery thing by me alleged or said, the proufe of private Masse (as he termeth it) can not immediately be concluded in some of a good argument, then he iustifieth
and

when M.
Jewel is
not able to
anoid the
force of
my reasons
or all: gain

and scoffeth out the mater, vseth tauntes for answers, and silēce (concerning the force of the reason) for confutation.

Yet that thou haue iust occasion good Reader to consider, how faithfullly he demeaneth him selfe in this place: two open and manifest vnttruthes I shal disclose, that he is not ashamed to report as very trutthes. The one is this. The priest (saith he) speaking of such order of Prayers as S. Iustine mentioneth, prayeth and goweth thanks in the *vulgar* tongue. which he shal neuer be able to iustifie, if by a *vulgar* tongue he meane any tong besides the learned tonges. This is his owne glose beside the text. The other is, that he reporteth me to say, that every Priuate Masse is common. which I say no where: but that every Masse is common.

After this I enter into an other mater, wherein by good evidence and witnesse I proue sole receiving to haue ben vied in the primitive Church by sundry deuoute persons both men and women. And this much I professe to do, because M. Jewel (as there I say) is so vehement an ennemie to Masse calling it *private*, for that the Priest receiveth alone. Al this he dissembleth, for any reasonable answer that he maketh to the contrary. And no maruel, for the mater being so certaine and so euident, how should not he be bozne with al for saying so litle, where nothing was to be said? Yet somewhat he saith, least he should seme to say nothing, and so be required to yelde and subscribe.

Jewel.

M. Jewel triumpheth, saith M. Harding, and maketh him selfe merry, as if he had vyoonie the feeles. No, no, M. Jewel triumpheth not, but geueth al triumph, victorie and glorie vnto God, that vyil subdue al them that vyithstand his truth, and make his enemies his foote stooles.

Harding.

That God would subdue them quickly, that M. Jewel

f iij

and

one commonly he suffereth the mater of woteh saying: it proueth not private masse

The. 111. vnttruth. not in the vulgar tong of the countrie, where S. Iustine was b. in. The. 112. vnttruth. I say not so.

Fol. 17. a.

A Reioindre to

and the rest of his Componions may be staft from seducing the people, and from leading them to enerlasting damnation by their wicked doctrine. But sye, why altered you my wordes? If you would seme to answer them, reason would, you should haue reported them truly. But truth is the thing that least hel- peth you. I say, you triumph as if you had wooune the scelde, making your selfe mery with these wordes, *vwhere then was the priuate Masse, vwhere then was the single Communion at this vubile?* Why dissembled you these wordes? They be to be found in your sermon. Are you ashamed of them? And how could you not be ashamed of them, were you not shamelesse? But because you saw, what good number of testimonies I had brought for single Communion, as you cal it: you thought it best to let your boasting wordes be couered with silence, least by reherfal of the, you should the rather haue uttered your owne ignorance, and vaine bragging. But what haue you to say to the witnessles of single Communion or sole receiuing, which you craked that no man was able to prone? You reppone the Masse because the priest receiuethe the Communion without companie in the same place, that is to say for the single receiuing. But the single receiuing I haue proued to be lawful by good euidence: Then must you no more raise at the Masse for the single Communion or receiuing. Let vs heare what you answer to those witnessles.

Iewel.

*The. 113. Excepting onely the fable of Amphilocheus, and Iohn the Almonare, which were not yerah the reckewing. I alleged *at the rest in mine ovrne*
Untruth. Sermon. I knery the, and had vreyghed them, and therfore I alleged them.
He alle- geth nor al

Harding.

Q. A few- eis impu- dencie in
ying. what is impudencie, if this be not impudencie? Because he wil nedes seme leaured, and to be ignorant of nothing: he is not ashamed to say, that he alleged in his Sermon al the testi- monies

nies, which I bring in my booke for Sole receiuing, two onely excepted: The booke of his Sermon is extant, any man may read it that wil. He allegeth not al the testimonies which I bring for proufe of Sole receiuing in the primitive Church. Onely he telleth that in the time of Tertullian, and of S. Cyprian, women commonly tooke the Sacrament home with them in their napkins, and laied it vp in their chestres, and receiued a portion of it in the morning before other meates, and this he telleth for an abuse of the Sacrament. Of al other so many testimonies, which in my booke I bring for proufe thereof, he toucheth not so much as one. Yet I knew them, saith he, and had vveighed them, and therefore I allegee them al in myne ovyne Sermon. Now good Reader take the paines to peruse M. Jewels said Sermon, and if thou fynde not al these testimonies there alleged, as certainly they be not there to be found: then geue such credite vnto him, as an open and manifest lye deserueth. But let vs see what the force of those eident testimonies hath giuen him to graunt.

Iewel.

That certaine godly persons both men and wemen in time of persecution, or of sicknesse, or of other necessitie receiued the Sacrament in their houses, it is not denied, neither is it any parcel of this question.

Harding.

The sole receiuing of godly persons in their houses pertaineth to this question. For whereas I haue said as you cal it in that respect the receiuing is private, is by your sect condemned onely for the priestes Sole receiuing, if it may be proued that deuoute persons of olde time receiued in their houses alone, and were not reprehended for it as breakers of Christs Institution, the breach wherof is not excused by any necessity it may happe to us

A Reioindre to

if this may be proued, then is the Masse, whereat the Priest receiveth alone, for which Luther first of al men called it private, not to be condemned. And so farre as this is proued, M. Jewel by his owne worde is bounde to yelde and subscribe. Having scuffed out the mater after his common maner with a foolish argument of two of his owne forgrie, he maketh this reason, and layeth it for his chiefe grounde.

Iewel.

The. 114.
vntruth.
It was
not abol-
ished.

This manner of priuate receiuing at home was not lawfull for the laie men, for it was *abolished by godly bishops in *General Council: Ergo, it was not lawfull for the Priest to say priuate Masse.

Harding.

The. 115.
vntruth.
The Cō-
cil of Ca-
saraugus-
ta was
not gene-
ral, but
prouincial.

what you meane by this manner of private receiuing at home, I know not. Sure I am that godly folkes private receiuing at home was both permitted in the primitive Church, and also wel allowed. And that sicke persons should haue the Sacrament brought home to them, to receiue before they departed this life, it was ordeined by the Nicene Council. The Council of Casaraugusta, which you allege for General, was not General, but prouincial: it was kept but by twelue bishops of Spain. Neither was it there decreed, that no deuoute person should be houseled at home, or for any cause be permitted to receiue the blessed Sacrament privately in his house: but that for auoiding certaine abuses, that then beganne to crepe in among the people, it should not be lawfull for any person that had receiued the blessed Sacrament, to conueigh it away priuely, and not forthwith to consume it in the Church. Of private receiuing at home, the Council speaketh neuer a worde.

Nicen.
Concil.
ca. 13.

The true
meaning
of the Ca-
ns by M.
Jewel al-
leged.

Concil.
Casaraugust.
Cap. 3.

The wordes of the Decree be these. Eucharistie gratiam si quis probatur acceptam non consumpsisse in ecclesia, anathema sit in perpetuum. If it be proued that any person haue receiued the

the grace of the Eucharist, and hath not continued it in the Church: be he a cursed for ever. where by the grace of the Sacrament, doubtless those fathers understood the true body of Christ, which is the thing of the Sacrament. For neither could they call bread by the name of grace; nor call a spiritual grace; what so ever the Sacramentaries will make of it, be properly said to be consumed: but of the body of Christ, which in that sacrifice is eaten, in respect of the outward form it may be said. Thus St. Jewels vnturth appeareth manifest, and by that monstrous Synode private houseing at home is not proued to have been abolished, as he saith it was.

The grace of the Eucharist.

Because St. Jewel pretendeth to haue great aduantage out of St. Iustinus Martyr, against the Masse, let vs see whether it be so or no. In Iustinus Martyr (saith he) I haue set forth the vnturth and plaine order of the holy Ministration used in the Church at that time. why then do ye not stand to that order, specially such that he was so neare vnto the Apostles time, and so farre within the compasse of your first six hundred yeres? After that order the cuppe was mingled with wine and water. Now, neither Christ, say you (in the 24. Division) nor any of his disciples gave such commandement. No man maketh any account thereof, the superstition only excepted. In your Communion this order is not obserued, neither thinke you it necessary. Yet you tell vs it was the plaine order of that Church, wherunto ye would now bring the whole worlde. The bread and wine mingled with water by that order were with the mystical prayer blessed, and with the wordes of our Lorde, Christs body and blood were consecrated.

Iustinus in Apolog. 2.

This is not obserued in your Communion. water vs ye note. Bread and wine ye bless not. The real presence of Christ ye believe not. Consecration ye trust not. In St. Iustinus time the blessed Sacrament was sent to them that were absent. This

A Reioindre to

1571
1572
1573

manner of priuatreceiuing as beinge vnauthorisat (tho you) for the late
wenn. It was abolished in the Council of Cosca August 2. ca. 3.

Thus you abridge three partes of the whole, telling vs of an or-
der, which was vled in S. Iustinus time, that now in the time
of your Gospel, and byage of reformatio, ye vbe not at al. How
then do you cal vs backe againe to the order of the primitive
Church? For let vs compare S. Iustinus Masse (so) so you cal
it your selfe) with your newe founde Communion. In S. Iusti-
nus Masse the mater of the Sacrament was bread, wine, and
water. In your Communion ye vbe no water at al. In S.
Iustinus Masse the body and bloud of Christe was consecrated.
In your Communion there is no such Consecration. In S.
Iustinus Masse was the oblation and Sacrifice. In your Co-
mmunion there is no such oblation and Sacrifice. In S. Iusti-
nus Masse the faithfull people receiued the body and bloud of
Christe. In your Communion you teach them they receiue but
bread and wine. In S. Iustinus Masse the blessed Sacrament
was sent to sicke persons. In your Communion it is not accorded
necessary, or any cruel iniurie at al: if sicke persons passe away,
and departe this life without it. Al this beinge so, with what
countenance can you allege y^e authoritie of S. Iustinus Masse,
to proue the antiquitie, and the right order of your Communion:
wherein ye haue thus forsaken the whole order of S. Iustinus
Masse: Merely your newe deuils whereof ye make so much, differ
eth from S. Iustinus Masse, nolesse then the shadowe from the
bodie, then darkenesse from light, then prophane thinges from
holy thinges.

S. Iusti-
nus masse
and ap.
Icicles
Communis
compared
together.

1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600

the 17. Division I come to reuerse testimonies for proufe
of priuate receiuing, or single Communion, as ap. Icicles cal-
leth

both it. I followe the same in the 15. and 16. Division. When
wilt Demainde Reader perhaps, whether I have so done. Un-
derstande I praye thee, that M. Jewell hath taken upon him to
inveigh at the Masse specially because of the single receiuing, pre-
tending it to be utterly unlawful and against the Institution of
Christe. For this cause I thought good to fortifie this point
with some good number of testimonies. Of the whole this much
redoundeth. If M. Jewell haue no other special matter, for which
he condemneth the Masse, but single or sole receiuing, who so e-
uer can by testimonies, of antiquitie proue sole receiuing to haue
ben vsed, and not accounted unlawful, he appueth M. Jewell ei-
ther to recant, or to shew for what els he condemneth the Masse.
If ye shew ought els, he is promised to be answered, if it be
worth the answering.

In this Division, as it hath pleased him to diuide my verities, **Testimo-**
three testimonies for prouofe of single receiuing be recited. The **nies for**
one is out of Tertullians second booke to his wife, the other out **single**
of S. Cyprians sermon de lapsis, the third out of the Ecclesiasti- **Communis**
cal historie of Eusebius, reporting after what manner one Mecha- **Euseb. ec-**
pion was handled before he departed this worlde. I referre the **cle. hist.**
reader to my booke, that is desirous to view & consider the places. **lib. 6. cap.**
To repeat againe here, that I haue said there, were a needlesse **44.**
doubling of labour. **Fol. 17. b**
8c.

Level.
M. Harding shooteth faire, but far from the mark. To proue private
Masse in the primitive Church, for lacke of priestes he allegeth Tertullians
wife, certaine women out of Cyprian, and Serapions boy: not the fittest
people that might haue ben founde to say Masse.

Harding.

The practise of faire shooting, but far from the mark. I leave
to M. Jewell, I conceit not so much to shoote faire, as to shoote
at home

A burthen
of lyes,

In his
Sermon.

Don't And strike the matter. Here I marke that I shoot at, is sin-
gle Communion; for which M. Jewel condemneth the Masse,
and whereof with a vaine bragge he made his vaine. *where*
then was the single Communion at this while? This marke whe-
ther I strike or no, I am content to be tryed by who so euer hath
eyes to see, and reason to iudge.

Yes M. Jewel him selfe seemeth (though it be much against
his will) the same to acknowledge. For where as he seeth him
selfe not able to answere the plaine and most euident testimonies,
he seeketh occasion to wangle vpon my argument: As though
when I proue private receiuing, forth with I concluded private
Masse, in such a sense as he imagineth. And therefore he would
blame his readers eyes, and beare him in hand, that I bring all
these places to inferre of ech of them I proue of private Masse.
For which I bring them not specially, as private Masse is taken
for the daily Sacrifice of the Church: but for private receiuing of
single Communion. And though there be in the margin of my
booke a note of psones for private Masse, which may wel stand
with that he seemeth to take private Masse for private Communion:
yet can no man be ignorant, who so enter readeth the place with
that goeth a litle before, and that foloweth: but that al those testi-
monies be alleged specially to proue single Communion. We-

Fol. 17. a. fore, these be my wordes. I wil bring in good euidence and wit-
nesse, that longe before S. Gregories time that he speaketh of,
faithful persons both men and women receiued the Sacrament
alone, and were neuer therefore repponed, as breakers of Christs
Institution. There before I enter into my rebursal, I say thus.

Fol. 17. b.

Fol. 21. b.

After I haue rebursed the testimonies,
I say thus. Here haue I brought much for proue of private and
single Communion, &c.

Thus my booke it selfe is a cleare witnesse, that I alleged
those

chose testimonies not for private Masse principally, as it signifieth the Sacrifice, but for private Communion: which as M. Jewel sawe wel enough, as it appeareth by his owne wordes: so, if he had not purposed to abandon al sinceritie & plaine dealing in this mater: he would not haue grated so much upon a bare margent note, but would haue replied to that which the booke it selfe, and the argument of that place most expressely reporteth. But this is his accustomed policie through his whole Replie, where learning, truth, and reason faileth, there to supplie with scoffes. which how so euer they delire light-headed, can not satisfie a godly minde desirous to be taught the sound doctrine of truth.

Say not therefore M. Jewel, that for prouise of private Masse, for lacke of Wicches, I allege Tertullians wife, certaine women out of S. Cyprian, and Serapions boye, as though they were reported to say Masse: I alleged not Tertullian, S. Cyprian, and Eusebius, to that purpose, but to the prouise of Sole receiuing. what say you to these Allegations: Answers directly to the point. After a long superfluous proceffe, wherein you say againe, that I said before touching Tertullian, and after the discharge of choier wherof your stomake boyled against me, for that my booke calleth you and your felowes by your common name, Gospellers: at length thus you answer.

M. Harding hath manifestly corrupted both the wordes, and meaning of Tertullian. He saith, the thing that we receiue is no bread. But so Tertullian saith not. His wordes be these. Thy husband wil thinke it (only) bread, and not that bread, that it is called.

Harding.

I haue not corrupted neither the wordes, nor the meaning of Tertullian. It is you rather that haue falsified and corrup-

M. Jewels
his common
policie to
supplie
scoffes,
where
good ma-
ter waiteth

The .116.
untruth.
I say it
not. Look
better on
my wordes
The .117.
untruth.
These be
not his
wordes,
this is a
plaine
corruption.

A Reioindreto

ted both, specially the meaning, as to euery one it shal manifestly appeare; that listeth to conferre the place with your false handling. For trial of your truth, euen at the first, you are taken with a lye. where saie I, the thing that wee receiue, is no bread? *Fol. 13. a.* Looker Reader in my booke, thou shalt finde, that I say not so, and therefore M^r. Jewel is founde an vntrue man. Among three points, which I note out of Tertullian by occasiō of his wordes, the third is, that the thing reuerently and deuontly befoze other meates receiued, is not bread, as the Infidels then, and the Sacramentaries now beleue, but the Body of Christ. Marke M^r. Jewel, I say, it is not bread, I say not, it is no bread. There is great difference between saying, not bread, and no bread.

Ioan. 6. If I had said, it is no bread, I had said vntruly, for it is the bread of life, it is the bread that came downe from heauen, it is the bread, of which who so euer eateth worthily, shal liue for euer. But that it is not bread, I might wel and truly say, for so is the faith of the Church, specially after Consecration, not bread, as the heathens beleued. If you beleue it to be bread stil after Consecration, then is your beleefe touching that point, no better then the Paines. Then when you see vs, if euer your faithlesse heare wil serue you to be present, receiue the Body of Christ vnder the forme of Bread, you wil thinke, as the heathens of whom Tertullian speaketh, thought, it to be bread, not him, who it is called, or that bread, which it is called, which is al one in a right sense.

Tertul. lib. 2. ad vxor. rem. But let vs examine the place. Tertullians wordes to his wife, aduertising her not to marry in marriage with an Infidel after his death, be these, thus truly pointed, as the later edition of Basile, and that also of Paris hath. Non sciet maritus, quid secreto ante omnem cibum gastes. Et si sciuerit, panem, non

non illum credet esse, qui dicitur. which woordes be so put in my booke, and thus englished. wil not thy husbände know, what thou eatest secretly before al other meate? And if hee doo knowe, hee will beleene it to bee breade, and not him, who it is called. what Chyisten man is there, that beleuing, as the Catholique Church teacheth, will finde fault with this translation?

¶ Yet wel not beleuing concerning the presence of Chyistes body in the blessed Sacramēt, as the Catholique Church doth, but as Caluine, Peter Martyr, Hooper, Bale, and the rest of the Sacramentaries do: bitterly reproveth me, for that I haue not so englished the woordes, as I might seme to make of that high Mysterie no better then Bakers bread. Let vs consider then how he hath corrected my translation. Reason were, that so impatient and hasty a reponer, should him selfe do nothing reprobable. Tertullians wordes be these, saith M. Iewel. Thy husband wil thinke it (onely) breade, and not that bread that it is called.

¶ Yea M. Iewel: Is that the true english of these Latine woordes, Panem, non illum credet esse, qui dicitur? woe you in by your Parenthesis, this worde onely, in the first parte of the sentence? Againne who taught you to be so bolde, as to adde an other worde, bread, to the second parte? And who gaue you guthoritie to alter the order of the woordes? who moze openly woortheth corruption, you, that adde of your owne, and make such a change of the order: or I that turns it truely, as I finde the plate, worde for worde? Yet what a doo make you about it, and haue neuer done? wherein you shewe moze spite then witt, moze raucour then learning.

In the. xij. Article of your booke. vi. Division, you enter into it againe, where you spitte forth moze of your malice

M. Iew.
corrup-
teth Ter-
tullian, to
draw him
to serue
his Sa-
cramenta-
ria heresie.

upon.

A Reioindre to

vpon me, then you bestowe proufe vpon the mater. Yea you
 seme to mistrust your holde, and for your credites sake, you are
 faine to alter the sentence, and to patch on words of your owne,
 therein confessing openly, that without the craft of a corrupter,
 and falsifier, you were not hable to make that good, for which
 you haue so laden me with cartloades of spitefull reproches. In
 that place you falsifie both Latine and English. For you make
 Tertullian to speake thus, Si scierit maritus tuus, panem esse
 credet, non illum (Panem) qui dicitur. If thy husband know
 it, (being an Infidel) he wil beleue it to be (bare) bread, but
 not that (bread) that it is called. Where as Tertullian saith
 thus, Panem, non illum credet esse, qui dicitur: This corrup-
 ter hath quite changed the order of the words, and maketh Ter-
 tullian to speake not like Tertullian, that if he were aliue at
 this day, he could not wel knowe the sentence to be his. Into
 one litle sentence of seven wordes, he hath put thre Parenthe-
 ses, to dodge by a sense after his owne liking. And al to thin-
 erit the Reader should beleue, that bread that it is called, to bee
 the only Sacrament, mysterie, or signe of our Loides Body, not
 the very Body in dede.
 For he meant by illum qui dicitur, Christes very true flesh in
 dede, of which it is said, My flesh is verely meate: I would þ bet-
 ter holde with his translation, though it seme more violent, þ or-
 der and pointing of the wordes duely considered. And what a
 busines maketh hee about illum panem, as though Tertullian
 had ioyned panem to illum? which because hee hath not so done,
 who so euer englisheth illum, him, meaning Christe, who is the
 bread of euclasting life, englisheth it as cruely and according to
 the faith of the Church, as he that turneth it, that breade. If
 Jewel beleued this bread to be þ flesh of Christ, vnder þ form
 of bread, my translation should seme to him right and good.

But

But he soundeth fault with me for englishing, illum, him, because it soundeth in his conceite, as if it were the person of a man. For so he reponeth that my translation both here, and also in the 11. article. 2. Division. And that his reprouse might haue some colour, he imagineth me to haue a very false and absurd meaning: which is as he falsly reporteth, that it was the very person of a man, which the woman had in her haunde, and did eate before other meate. Then cometh me he in with the saying of Cyrillus which he allegerh oftentimes, and yet it maketh most cleerly against him, as I haue declared in the second part of my Confutation of the Apologie. The saying of Cyrillus is this, as he pretendeth, though in dede it be otherwise by that farther offered: *homo assueratus anthropophagiam. We teach not our people to eate the person of man.*

The de-
fence of my
translation
of Tertul-
lians
wordes.

The. 118.
Anruth.
It is the
body of
Christe, or
Christ
him selfe
God and
man.
fol. 108. A.

By Anthropophagia, Cyrillus understandeth the beastly and unkindly eating of the body of a mere common man. And because Nestorius the heretike divided Christe, and disolued the whole mysterie of his Incarnation, teaching the worde to be the Sonne of God, not of Mary, and Christe man the sonne of Mary, not of God: whereby he destroyed the meane of the union of both natures in Christe, to thintent the body of Christe might be esteemed but for a common body as men haue, and not the wordes proper body, which hath power to vivificate and quicken al thinges: Cyrillus to shew the absurditie of this heresie, dyuerteth him to the consideration of the blessed Sacrament, and demandeth of him, who by his doctrine made of Christe two Sonnes, and so two Persons, diuiding God the worde, from Christe the man, whether in these mysteries he thought, that we eate a man. What (saith he to Nestorius) dost thou pronounce this our Sacrament to be the eating of a man? and driest yareuerently the mindes of them which haue beleued vnto grosse ima-

Cyrl. in
reponse
ad undeci-
mū ana-
themati-
smū Theo-
dorit.

nations, and attemptest with humaine imaginations to treat of those things, which are attained vnto by an only, pure, and exquisite faith: Of this whole point I haue more fully treated in my Confutation of the Apologie. There I aduise the reader to see further.

Col. 108.

Now to answer you *Mr. Iewel*, I tel you, as *Cyprian* told *Alexandria*, that forasmuch as we eat not in these mysteries a common body of a man, but the body of *Christe* the Sonne of God, that is to say, that body which is proprium verbi, the proper body of the word, which quickeneth all things, and by receiving the same, we receive whole *Christe* God and man: in translating the forementioned wordes of *Tertullian* spoken of the blessed Sacrament, hauing in mynde the body of *Christe* after Consecration to be really present vnder the forme of bread: I may fully & rightly those wordes illum. quid dicitur, thus, him, who it is called. And therein I can not seme to any christen man to meane, as *Mr. Iewel* scaundereth, that it was the very person of a man which the woman is reported to haue had in her hand to eat before other meates. For my faith which is the faith of the Catholike church presupposed, it is manifest, that by illum, him, I meane not the person of a common man, which *Mr. Jewel* is obiecting vnderstandeth, but the only and singular person of *Christe*, who is both God and man. I ex. vs. see, what he saith to other testimonies.

The, 119.
In truth.
God was
not offend-
ed with
the keepg.
but with
the presump-
tion of the
woman,
who open-
ed the
chest with
unworthy
hands.

The storie that *S. Cyprian* reporteth as it sheweth the manner of keeping the Sacrament, *so it seemeth also to shew, that God was offended with the same.

Having

So ly, that is your private collection. *S. Cyprian* in that storie vittereth not so much as one worde, whereby he may seme

so shew, that God was offended either with keeping the blessed Sacrament at home, or with private receiving of it. God was offended not with the keeping, but with the woman, who presumed to open the chest wherein the holy thing of our Lord was laid, indignis manibus, with unworthy handes. And it appeareth by the circumstance of the place, that in time of persecution, for feare she had denyed Christe, and done Sacrifice to Idols. For which she was unworthy to receive it. And when notwithstanding her haynous offence, she attempted to touch it, spire rose out of the chest, and frayed her awaye. This story witnesseth unto vs the accustomed manner of the reuerēt keeping of the Sacrament at that time. And if this woman had not committed that greuous crime, but had kept her selfe like a true and good Churche woman: God had not only not shewed him selfe offended with the keeping and Sole receiving of the Sacrament, but also for the same had geuen her increase of grace.

*Cyprian.
serm. 5.*

*de lapsis.
S. Cyprian place
opened.*

Concerning the story of Serapion, when St. Iewel hath scoffed his til at the most holy Masse, and said al that his scornful witte could deuise: he can say nothing toherby to auoid private receiving, for prouise whereof, & nor for prouise of private Masse directly, as he would faine men should beleue, Alleged the same. This is the private, single, or Sole receiving, for which chiefly the Masse is repproued, by thre good and sufficient testimonies approued.

Serapion.

Now for answer to certaine the chiefe points of his scoffing Replie in this. 17. Division byely set together:

Iewel.

To proue Private Masse, for lacke of priestes he allegeth Tertullians wife, women out of Cyprian, Serapions boye, and geueth a special note in the margin of his Booke, Prouises for private Masse. &c.

Harding.

proves
for Sole
receiving.

The aduertisement of Terrullian to his wife, the presumptuous putting of vntwoofy handes to the Sacrament of the woman out of S. Cyprian, the sending of Serapions boye with the Sacrament, make prouise, that in those daies, and in those churches, there was sole receiving, the matter pertinent, the authorities auncient, the truth euident, and yet hercbypon M. Jewel soezech arguments like vilsardes and Amikes, to moue laughter, telling vs that Terrullians wife, the woman out of S. Cyprian, the boye of Serapion be brought in to proue private Masse, and y they be no fitte persons to say Masse. whether he missestell not the tale, and scoffingly conclude, what was not meant: let him iudge, that hath eyes to see, let him vnderstande that hath eares to heare. And this was one point, for prouise whereof he cried so importunately in his Challenge, *Where was then (quod he) the vuate Masse? Where was then the single Communion?*

The crye
that M.
Jewel
made in
proclai-
ming his
Challege,
as by the
and sub-
mo exam-
ples an-
swered.

And because the Sole receiving or single Communion then vled, as wel by the people as by the priest, which the said could not be proued: prouise was first entred for single communion, and a note in the Margent added (Prouises for Private Masse) by principal consequent intended. whereat M. Jewel scoffingly solaceth him selfe, as though some cracke had bene made, or through placing of a margent Note substance of Doctrine could be diminished. By such hasty noting a man might note to him, that his note in the frounte of his first Article is not to the purpose, sith his principal point is (if he mynde to proue ought) to proue his Communion.

Terrull.
lib. 4. con-
tra Mar-
cionem.

To mainteine his Sacramentarie heresie, he doth great wrong vnto Terrullian, whom by false translation he would make a Sacramentarie, whose doctrine in that Article is catholike. *Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis corpus suum illum*

lum fecit. The bread (saith he) which he tooke and distributed vnto his Disciples, the same he made his body. In respect of his doctrine and common faith, he may not otherwise turne Treutlian, then I turned the place, except he turne al to bread, as he doth in his bakerly Communion. Al his shifts and forgeries are to prophane the holy and blessed Sacrament, and therefore he calleth it very bread. For saith he:

Jervel.

The thing which our bodily mouth receiveth, is very bread. Both the scriptures and also the olde catholike Fathers put it out of doubt, S. Paule five times in one chapter nameth it bread.

Harding.

You offend sy: by your leaue in bearing false witness against the Scriptures, the Fathers, against S. Paule, against Christe. He said, this is my body. S. Paule saith not that Christes is very bread, as ye take bread. The Fathers witness our mouth and flesh, touch and eate his flesh. He hath persuaded vs. to fasten our teeth in his flesh, saith S. Chrysostome. Where the wordes of Christe have wrought, there is the bloud of life, that redeemed the people, saith S. Ambrose. Againe saith S. The priest speaketh Corpus Christi, the body of Christe: and thou saith, Amen, that is, true it is. What the tongue confesseth, let thy harte holde. The flesh eateth the body and bloud of Christe, to the end the soule haue his fil of God, saith Tertullian. That Christes body is very bread, neither scripture, nor Father reporteth.

But S. Paule say you nameth it bread in one Chapter five times. This is not denied, but we answer you according vnto your owne sense, bringing vnto your remembrance, what you avouched before in the 15. Division: that Eucharistia in S. Irenaeus might signifie bread, that was prepared for the Sacrament.

The. 110.
Untruth.
Both the
scriptures
& Fathers
report it to
be the true
body of
Christe.

Mat. 26.

Chrysostom.
hom. 45.

in Ioan.

Ambrosius
de sacram.
lib. 4. ca. 5.

Ibidem.

Tertullian
lib. 1. de

Resurrecti
one Carnis

1. Cor. 11.

Prooues
for Sole
receiuing.

The aduertisement of Tertullian to his wife, the presumption putting of two hands to the Sacrament of the woman out of S. Cyprian, the sending of Serapions boye with the Sacrament, make prouise, that in those daies, and in those churches, there was sole receiuing, the matter pertinent, the authorities auncient, the truth euident, and yet hereupon Mr. Jewel forcerth arguments like vilsardes and Antikes, to moue laughter, telling vs that Tertullians wife, the woman out of S. Cyprian, the hope of Serapion be brought in to proue private Masse, and y they be no fitte persons to say Masse. whether he missestell nor the tale, and scoffingly conclude, what was not meant: let him iudge, that hath eyes to see, let him vnderstande that hath eares to heare. And this was one point, for prouise whereof he cried so importunately in his Challenge, *Where was then (quod he) the private Masse? Where was then the single Communion?*

The crye
that Mr.
Jewel
made in
procla-
ming his
Challenge,
is by chrl
and sundry
mo exam-
ples an-
swered.

And because the Sole receiuing or single Communion was then vsed, as wel by the people as by the Priest, which thing he said could not be proued: prouise was first entred for single Communion, and a note in the Margent added (Prooues for Private Masse) by principal consequent intended. whereat Mr. Jewel scoffingly solaceth himselfe, as though some cracke had ben made, or through placing of a margent Note substance of Doctrine could be diminished. By such hasty noting a man might note to him, that his note in the frount of his first Article is not to the purpose, sith his principal point is (if he myade to proue ought) to proue his Communion.

Tertull.
lib. 4. con-
tra Mar-
cionem.

To mainteine his Sacramentarie heresie, he doth great wrong vnto Tertullian, whom by false translation he would make a Sacramentarie, whose doctrine in that Article is catho-
like. *Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis corpus suum il-
lum*

lum fecit. The bread (saith he) which he tooke and distributed vnto his Disciples, the same he made his body. In respect of his doctrine and common faith, he may not otherwise turne *Arculan*, then I turned the place, except he turne al to bread, as he doth in his bakerly Communion. Al his shiftes and forgeries are to prophane the holy and blessed Sacrament, and therefore he calleth it very bread. For saith he:

Jewell.

The thing which our bodily mouth receiveth, is very bread. Both the scriptures and also the olde catholike Fathers put it out of doubt. S. Paule five times in one chapter nameth it bread.

Harding.

You offend sy; by your leaue in bearing false witness against the scriptures, the Fathers, against S. Paule, against Christe. Christe said, this is my body. S. Paule saith not that Christes body is very bread, as ye take bread. The Fathers witnesseth that our mouth and flesh, touch and eate his flesh. He hath permitted vs. to fasten our teeth in his flesh, saith S. Chrysostome. Where the wordes of Christe haue wrought, there is the bloud made, that redemed the people, saith S. Ambrose. Againe saith he, The priest speaketh Corpus Christi, the body of Christe: and thou saist, Amen, that is, true it is. What the tongue confesseth, let thy harte holde. The flesh eateth the body and bloud of Christe, so thende the soule haue his fil of God, saith Tertullian. That Christes body is very bread, neither scripture, nor Father reporteth.

But S. Paule say you nameth it bread in one Chapter five times. This is not denied, but we answer you according vnto your owne sense, bringing vnto your remembrance, what you auouched before in the 15. Division: that Eucharistia in S. Ierome might signifie bread, that was prepared for the Sacrament.

The. 120.
Truth.
Both the
scriptures
& Fathers
reposit it
to be the true
body of
Christe.

Mat. 26.

Chrysostom.
hom. 45.
in Ioan.
Ambrosius
de sacram.
lib. 4. ca. 5.
Ibidem.
Tertullian
lib. 1. de
Resurrecti
one Carnis
1. Cor. 11.

A Reiaindre to

say it please you then to vnderstand, that S. Paule likewise, and the catholike fathers meane enen so, when they cal the Sacrament bread.

Four
kinds of
bread.

Mat. 14.

Luc. 9.

Ioan. 6.

Ibidem.

Ibidem.

The Gospel mentioneth vnto vs. liij. kinds of bread. First that bread, wherewith Christ fed. v. m. persons in wilderness. Secondly, that bread which was called Manna. Thirdly, that bread, which is Christ the Sonne of God. Fourthly that bread, which Christ promised to geue, to witte, his flesh. The name maketh smal prouise. Manna is called bread, and so is Christ, yet neither of them is bread in nature.

this bread
that bread

S. Paule calleth it panem hunc, this bread, and panem illum that bread, which is a note material, because it is so named with demonstration, & hath relation vnto the body wherof S. Paule speaketh, no lesse then of the bread. The bread which we breake, saith he, is it not the communicating of the body of Christe? Lo there is the body. And reporting the wordes of Christe, This is my body. Againe, reuserit corporis, he hath be guilty of the body. Item where he saith, nondiudicans corpus domini, putting no difference between the body. &c. Neither could S. Paule meane otherwile, then Christe and his Gospel had taught him.

A peculi-
ar phrase
of the
scrip-
tures.

Gen. 2.3.

Exod. 7.

Ioan. 2.

Adde you here vnto, which you are not ignorant of, the proper and peculiar phrase of the scripture, which is to retain names of thinges once changed: As Man is called earth, the Serpēt is called a rod, wine is called water, for that Man was made of earth, the Serpēt was before a rodde, the wine was once water. Ene so the body of Christ beareth þ name of bread, because bread that was prepared for the Sacramēt, through the almightie power of the word in consecration is conuerted into the body of Christ, and is then made such a bread as Ignatius meant, where he said, Panē Dei volo, panem cœlestem, panē vitæ, qui est caro Iesu Christi filij Dei vini. I desire the bread of God, the heauēly bread, þ bread of life, which is the flesh of Iesus Christ þ sonne of þ liuing god.

Ignatius
epist. ad
Romanos.

The

The places of Gelasius and Theodoretus are answered in my Confutation of the Apologie. S. Chrysostome, Origen, S. Iustinus Martyr, S. Irenaeus, S. Clement, and your pretended others, shalbe answered, when we heare them speake. In this place they are brought in like Chymmers in a Chymmerie for a shewe, and say nothing. Neither when they speake, do they say as you report, which is this great vntueth.

Iewel.

They al together with one consent haue confessed, that in the Sacrament there remaineth the nature and substance of bread.

Harding.

For disproue of your false witness, take you here some of their sayings. S. Chrysostome, how farre he is from that you father vpon him, signifieth by these wordes.

Num vides panē? num vinum? &c. what, seest thou bread? seest thou wine? Go they (trowest thou) into the draught? God forbid. Thinke not so. For euen as waxe, if it be put vnto the fire, is made like vnto it, nothing of his substance remaineth, nothing abideth of it: so thinke here, that the Mysteries are consumed away by the substance of the body (of Christ). What saith this learned father els, but y the substance of the elements in these mysteries are quite vorte away, and consumed by the substance of our Lordes body, which is the Transubstantiation that the Catholike Church by the vse of a fittie terme teacheth? Were doth not S. Chrysostome confesse the remaining of the substance of bread, as you haue falsely reported of him, but the quite contrary.

S. Irenaeus saith, Quomodo cōstabit eis, panem in quo gratia actz sint, corpus esse Domini sui, & calicem sanguinis eius, si non ipsum fabricatoris mundi filiū dicant? How shal it be certain vnto them, that the bread, vpon which the thanks are gēten, (whereby he meaneth Consecration) is the body of their Lord, and that the cuppe is of his blood, if they say, he is not the sonne of the maker of the worlde?

In the
Confuta-
tion.
fol. 92.a.

Chry. 121.
In truth.
They co-
fesse viter
by the con-
trary.

Chrysosta.
hom. de
Euchari-
stia in En-
canijs.
Transub-
stantiation.

Irenaeus
lib. 4.
cap. 34.

Origenes
contra
Celsum.
lib. 3.

The final
reuerence
that M.
Jewel
beareth to
the Sac-
rament.

fol. 106. B.

Augusti.
in Psal.
98.

A Reioindre to

We eate (saith Origen) the offred breads which through Consecration and prayers are made into a certaine holier body, in sanctius quoddam corpus constantur, which wordes import a change of substance.

Also here M. Jewel seemeth to geue no more reuerence & worship to the body of Christe in the Sacrament, then to the water of Baptisme, to the booke of the Gospel, no more the the Jewes gaue to their Manna. For a shitt at a pinch he compareth the one Sacrament with the other, the Eucharist with Baptisme, which two agree in common nature of Sacrament, but otherwise differ wholly. The presence of Christe in Baptisme, and in the Eucharist is declared to be diuerse in the Confutation of the Apologie. The one is a Sacrament onely in fieri, as the Scholemen speake in vse and action, not hauing after the Sacramental wordes pronounced any such being. The other remaineth afterward. Christes wordes assure vs of his being present, no wordes teacheth vs of his departing. The Eucharist is perfited by Consecration, Baptisme in application. In the Eucharist there is Transubstantiation of creatures, in Baptisme there is none. The priest in the administratio of Baptisme speaketh in his own perſon, Ego baptizo te, I baptize thee. &c. In the Consecration of the Eucharist, he speaketh in the perſon of Christ, hoc est corpus meum. This is my body.

Neuer was it taught, nor Christen people euer beleued, that in Baptisme Christe was present in forme of water, but Christe taught, and his Church beleueth, that in the Eucharist through Consecration he is present in forme of bread. And therefore is that Sacrament reuerenced in an other degree, then Baptisme. Because Christe walked here in flesh, saith S. Augustin, and the very same flesh he gaue vs to eate to our Salvation, and no man eateth that flesh, except he adore it: it is founde out how such a footestoolle of our Lorde may be adored.

In

In the place by M. Jewel alleged out of S. Augustine touching like diligence to be imployed for the keeping of the word of God, & it fal not out of our hart being once receined, as we take heede that nothing of the body of Christe fal downe on the ground, when it is ministred vnto vs: in that place S. Augustine rebuketh the people of negligence, and inuiterh them to more readinesse in hearing and bearing away the worde of God. He doth not say wherby we should conceine, & it is as great offence to receine the worde of Christe negligently, as the body of Christ vntwoyethly. That were a dreadfull saying, and a heauy meaning. A negligent eare, a slothfull hart may sometimes happen without gile of Christes death, which they incurre, who receine his body vntwoyethly.

2. q. 1. Interrogo vos. Inter hominibus quibus quaginta hominibus. 26.

This much is here to be noted by the way, that in this homilie S. Augustine speaking of the reuerence that people the did beare to the blessed Sacrament, saith they tooke great heede, that nothing of the body of Christ might fal out of their handes downe vpon the ground. By which wordes the real presence is plainly auouched.

What reuerence is to be geuen to the Gospel booke, may be iudged by that we read in the fourth Council of Constantinople, We decree, (say the Fathers there) that the holy Image of our Lorde Iesus Christe Sauour of al be worshipped with equal honour with the booke of the holy Gospels.

Synodi generalis. 8. can. 3.

And what honour we ought to do vnto the wordes of Christe pronounced, we may learne of y^e auncient Father Ioseph Anastasius, whose decreet is, that priestes & al others that be present at the Gospel, sit not, but stand stooping downe reuerently, and attently heare the wordes of our Lord, and worship them faithfully.

Anastasio 1. epist. ad Episcopos German. & Burgundia. cap. 1. Fideliter adorant.

But now let vs consider what answer is made to auoid other witnessses, which I alleged to proue sole receining.

¶ The

A Reioindre to

Ths. 18. Diuision.

For private Communion or sole receiuing I allege S. Basil ad Cæsariam. who writeth that holy Hermites lyuing in wildernesse solitarily, and aparte from al companie, hauing no Priest nor Deacon, among them, receiue the Communion euery one by him selfe, which for that purpose they kepe in their cellles. He reporteth also that in Alexandria and in Egypt euery one of the people, hath for the more part the Communion in his house, to receiue as deuotion serueth. who despyeth to reade the place set forth more largely, him I referre to my booke. By testimonie of this place reservation and sole receiuing of the Communion is plainly proued.

S. Jewel in his Replie pretendeth this place of S. Basil to be impertinent, because it maketh not mention of the Masse. Yet seeing it hath pleased me. to colour and to embolse out this auncient Father, as he sayth, as if he spake plainely of my syde, whereas in dede he uttereth manifest recorde, against private Masse: he wil not bitterly leaue him in silence.

*Q. Jew.
misreporteth
S. Basil's
epistle ad
Cæsariā.
Patriciā.*

First he misreporteth the point which S. Basil treateth, saying that the noble woman Cæsaria doubted, whether one might touch and receiue the blessed Sacrament with his owne handes, and therfore demaunded S. Basiles resolution. This he calleth a very nice question, and meete for a Gentle woman as Cæsaria was, to demaunde. Upon this he entred into a common place, and with many wordes proueth, that the practise of the Church for a long time was, deuout persons to receiue the Sacrament in their handes,

des, which noman denyeth, and therfore the whole proceſſe is needeleſſe and impertinent.

The point wherof this deuout noble woman Caſaria ſtode in doubt, was not whether one might touch & receiue the Sacrament with his owne handes: but, as it appeareth by S. Baſil, whether in time of perſecution, when there is neither Biſhop nor Deacon preſent, one might without offence miniſter the Sacrament vnto him ſelfe with his owne handes. This doubt roſe of reuerence and deuotion, and of feare to offend by preſumption, not of a fooliſh niceneſſe, as M. Jewel ſaith. For anſwere and reſolution of this doubt, S. Baſil repoſteth vnto her, the cuſtome and manner of holy men that liued alone in wiſderneſſe, and of the faithfull people of Alexandria and Egypte, mouing her by their example, thereof to make no conſcience. M. Jewel after that he hath ſhewed his copie for prouſe of a matter, that no wiſe man doubted of, and hath repoſted againe the whole ſaying of S. Baſil, which I laid forth plainly in my booke: at length for anſwer to me ſaith thus,

The ſpecial point treated by S. Baſil ad Caſariam.

Jewel.

But much I marvel, how M. Harding can gather hereof his priuate Maſſe. Touching his ſue ſpecial notes, if we graunt them thoroughly e- uery one, yet is he nothing the nearer his purpoſe. For his maſſe is none of them.

Harding.

I marvel much M. Jewel, with what face you require me of theſe teſtimonies to conclude priuate Maſſe, as it is the Sacrifice of the Church. You know wel enough, where about I go in this place, not to proue priuate Maſſe directly, but priuate receiuing of Communion, & conſequently priuate Maſſe. For it is it, for which you condemne it. My booke repoſteth it plainly, what bliſſe

& u answer

A Reioindre to

Mr. Jew.
doth like
vnto the
builders
of the tower
of Babel

answer make you? why do you so vntruthfully abuse your reader? At the building of the tower of Babylon, they say, through confusion of language, when one called for mortar, an other brought a hammer, and what so euer was demanded, a contrary thing was answered. Do not you the like **Mr. Jewell**? Yea do you not worse, how much worse it is to do a misse wittigly, then ignorantly? I bring proues for private receiuing of the Communion: you replie ouerthwartly and beside the purpose, saying the testimonies which I bring proue not private Masse. So in the beginning of this Article, I alleged sundry places for the vnbloody Sacrifice, and you replie to euery one, that they proue not private Masse. Both there and here my allegations be directed to proue that which is denyed presently, not to proue that which so is not denyed.

Ieruel.

The Eremites sole receiuing, as it nothing hindereth vs, that denie not the fact, so it nothing furthereth him, onlesse he will haue lay men, and women to do so still.

Harding.

Examples of sole receiuing be not alleged to the ende that lay men and women should do so still. But forasmuch as you graunt the fact of sole receiuing, I demaunde of you, whether it were lausful, or vnlauful. If it were lausful in Eremites, in euery of the people of Alexandria, and of Egypte, in Tertullians wife, in Scapion, and in other lay men and women: why is not the same lausful in a priest? Shew vs some good reason, scripture, Councel, or auncient Father, whereby it may clerely and sufficiently be proued, that though it be lausful in lay folke, yet it is not lausful in a priest. If you say, it was alwayes, & in al persons vtterly vnlauful to receiue alone without company: what if haue so good witnesse of it we beleue you not? How are you able to proue it?

If

If you proue it not, these manifest testimonies & examples must
eme vnto vs prouie sufficient that it was not vnlaful for the
time it was so vsed. And thus sole receiuing proued laful
furthereth our purpose.

Iewel.

The reason that S. Basile maketh of custome and continuance, being
vvel considered, is very weake, both for many other good and iust cau-
ses, and also for that the same custome, as it was neuer vniuersally recei-
ued, so vpon better aduise by order of the Church it was cleane abolished.

Harding.

If you reprove S. Basile that light of the worlde, for ma-
king very weake reasons, it is no marvel, if I finde so litle fa-
uour and equitie at your handes. Such that you presumed to
saie vpon that most excellent Father, it was reason you should
haue shewed som of your other good & iust causes, specially seeing
the cause which here you pretend, is no cause at al. For you must
shew vs, where this custome was reiected, and when, in what
Proruince, by whom, & by auctoritie of what general Councel &
Church tooke order for the vtter abolishing of the custome that
we speake of, that is to say, where it was decreed, that no faith-
ful person in time of persecution should haue the Sacrament at
home, and receiue it priuately. It is not inough for you to say
it. We haue litle cause to helene your bare woordes. If you
haue no better place to allege, then the Decree made by twelue
Spanish Bishops assembled at the Synode of Cesarangust,
then are you destitute of proufe, for that Decree pertaineth not
to this case, as I haue declared here before. For those Fathers
forbad not the godly vse of Sole receiuing at home in time of
persecution, but the abuse of not consuming the Sacrament re-
ceiued in the Church, but secretly reserved vnto euil pur-
poses, in time of peace and quiet.

M. Iew.
reproueth
S. Basile
for making
a weake
reason
which is
contrary
to his pre-
mise.

Council. Ca
sarangust.
cap. 3.

x ij

Iewel.

A Reioindre to

Iewel.

Wise men in Gods causes haue euermore mistrusted the auctoritie of custome.

Harding.

Customs
contrary
to truth, &
customs
agreeable
to truth.
Cyprian
ad Pomp.
contra E-
pist. Ste-
phani.

Customes be of two sortes, contrary to truth, or agreeable to truth. Such customes as be contrary to truth, the auncient Fathers haue not onely mistrusted, but also haue abrogated, and putged the Church of them. Custome without truth, is an olde maintenance of Errour, saith S. Cyprian. But to such customes as be agreeable to truth, the wisest of the Fathers haue alwayes geuen reuerence, credite, and auctoritie.

M. Jewel seeing him selfe bymen to shifres, causleth and wrangleth vpon wordes, & geueth out a surmise of the Eremites which S. Basile speaketh of, came togeather as it were to the celebration of a solemne Communion, in which one tooke vpon him the Priestes and Deacons office, and ministred to the rest. But this is a mere gheasse of M. Jewels owne head. For neither is it likely, that any Eremitte professing so great humilitie as they did, would take such preeminence vpon him, specially without al example of the Church: and the wordes of S. Basile seme plainly to reposite the contrary. For the question being moued, whether any man through compulsion of necessitie in times of persecution, no Priest nor Deacon being present, might with his owne hand take the Communion & minister to him selfe: how had he satisfied the question, by making answeare, if it was found laudful by long custome & practise of the Eremites, among whom one was wont to take vpon him the office of a Priest and Deacon, and ministred vnto the rest: The question was not of touching the Sacrament with the hande, for the custome of the Church had put it mater out of doubt long before: but whether one might priuately minister vnto him selfe alone without Priest or Deacon, Propria manu, with his owne hand. Againe if they

resolved

resorted together, and assembled them selues into cōgregations, how may thei be said in that respect to haue liued a solitary life in wilderness, which S. Basile reporteth of them? So their life had ben sociable & cōpanable, not solitary. Besides this S. Basils words must be referred specially to y^e single receiuing of one person. For he saith expressly, It is no hainous mater in absence of Priest and Deacon, quempiam propria manu Cōmunionem sumere, for one to receiue the Communion with his owne hands.

Furthermoze M. Iewels gheasse is quite dashed, except he were able to proue, y^e euery one of y^e people in Alexandria, & ouer Egypt, had a wife, children, or familie, among whom he might play the Minister. For I wene hee shal hardely persuaide any wise man the contrary, but that among so many thousands some were without wife or familie to minister vnto: which if it were true, thei then by S. Basils report ministered to the selues alone. For that they went to their neighbours houses to receiue with companie, as the Jewes did in old time to eat the paschal lambe, Exod. 12. so much can not be wooong out of S. Basiles saying.

As for the storie that M. Iewels telleth vs of Hippolytus Martyr, who as he saith, being a lay mā, ministered the Cōmunion to his wife, his children, and his seruants: though it proue nothing against vs, yet we haue M. Iewels in so good credit, that we wil reckon it for no better then for a tale of his owne deuise, until he shew vs by what approued Authoz it is recorded.

At this duely considered, it was lausful for me to turne S. Basiles wordes as I did: ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνοντες, they do Communicate with them selues alone: wherein I rendred sense for sense truly, though not word for word curiously. With which libertie, yea where the sense is some deale changed, if I should charge M. Iewels so oftentimes as he hath abused the same, of that very thing I should fill a booke.

Let M. Iewels shew himselfe not to haue forgotten this tale of his own head.

A Reioindre to

Ieruel.

This long Allegation of S. Basiles wordes, with al furniture therof, may shortly be gathered into this reason. These Eremites being no Priestes receiued alone: Ergo these Eremites being no Priestes, said priuate Masse.

Harding.

By M. Jewels scoffing Logique it may perhaps be gathered into such a foolish conclusion: but by good reason it can not, and in sooth it is not: as neither a number of the like Arguments made in his vaine forgetie, set forth through his whole booke, rather to shew of his light scoffing witte, then to the discredit of the Catholique doctrine. For answere to the point, if by priuate Masse you vnderstande none other thing, but the Priestes sole receiuing: so farre may the example of these Eremites be alleged for proufe of priuate Masse. But if by priuate Masse you vnderstand the Sacrifice of the Masse, as it is celebrated in the Church, in remembrance of Christes death, and is not in dede priuate: so it ought not specially and immediate, ly for proufe thereof to be alleged.

Ieruel.

The. 122.
vnto
truth,
Sole re-
ceiuing
was not
in the
time of
persecutio
taken for
an abuse,
rather
was it a-
bolished
by the
Church.

This sole receiuing was an abuse, and therefore * was abolished by the Church notwithstanding custome: Ergo, Priuate Masse likewise is an abuse, and ought to be abolished notwithstanding custome.

Harding.

Before I examine the goodnes of your Argument, I deny your Antecedent. How are you able to proue, that this Sole receiuing whereof S. Basile speaketh, was an abuse? And for what consideration was it abolished by the Church? In what General Councel was there any decree made for the abolishing of it? what Bishops were assembled for that purpose? By whom were they called? who was the President? why recite you not the wordes of the Canon? Must we nedes beleue it,

it, because M. Iewel saith so? Nay rather will not men mistrust him euen when he telleth trouth, because he is so comonly found a lyer: This apperteineth very much to your purpose M. Iewel substantially to proue. And when you haue proued that his sole receiuing was an abuse, which you shal neuer be able to do, for your place of the Synode of Cæsaraugusta can not serue your Can. 3. cōuener: then shal it behoue you also to proue, that sole receiuing in general was an abuse, or els your conclusion þat p̄nate Masse is likewise an abuse (that being meant by p̄nate Masse which we cal the Masse) will be espied halting. So long as by al the wicked learning of the founders of your Gospel Luther, and Zuinglius, by the crafty conueiance of Peter Martyr, Caluine, and Canisius, by the subtiltie of Sathan him selfe, you shal not be able to proue sole receiuing to be an abuse, and contrary to Christs Institution: the Masse shal remaine vnsaken.

Iewel.

Now let vs see, whether these very selfe wordes of S. Basil here alleged by M. Harding, make any thing for the holy Communion. And what authoritie can be against vs, if M. Hardinges owne authorities be founde with vs?

Harding.

What meaneth this p̄face of so great confidence? You seme to promise much. If you performe litle, how shal not your own fauourers thinke you to haue moze ostentation in wordes, then substance in matter? Marke wel, what you promise to performe. See that you stepp not a syde from your owne offer. So not from these very selfe wordes by me here alleged. As touching the Communion, for the single and p̄nate receiuing of it, the place by me was brought, it shalbe needefulle to proue that, which no man denyerth.

p. 1

Iewel

A Reioindre to

Leysel.

S. Basil in the same place saith thus. We do Communicate foure times in the weeke: vpon the Sunday, Wensday, Fryday, and Saturday. If vve may founde any thinge vpon vvordes, he saith, We Communicate: He saith not, We say Masse. And thus saith S. Basil, vve do foure times in the vveeke.

Harding.

But where be the very selfe wordes of S. Basil here alleged by M. Harding, that you pretended to make for you? haue you so soone forgotten, what you promised? I looked for the very selfe wordes, els why craked you so much of them? These were no; by me alleged pardy. Yet what make they against vs? what make they for you? S. Basil saith in that epistle, we communicate foure times in the weeke, what then? He speaketh it of himselfe, and of his private custome: neither saith he that he communicated only foure times in the weeke, but also vps other dayes, if y^e memorie of any Saint were kept, which you dissembled, least you should allege ought, y^e might founde to the estimation of Saintes.

And what if we say, S. Basil meant by those wordes, that he consecrated and offred the body and bloud of Christe foure dayes in the weeke, and at every time communicated, that is to say, receiued, as of right the Sacrifice offred ought to be receiued? To y^e pertecteth the prayer, which he was wont to say at his Masse, whereof he wrote a forme. In which he praied thus. Make me O Lord meete by the vertue of thy holy spirite, that being indued with the grace of priesthode, I may stand at this holy table, & consecrate thy holy and pure body, and thy pretious bloud. For thou art he that offerest, and art offered, he that takest, and doest geue, Christe our God. Now if we graunt you, that S. Basil consecrated, offred and receiued the Communion which he had consecrated, that is to say, celebrated or said Masse (as now we speake) foure times every weeke, and when so euer a Saintes day, or a com-

*Basil in
lignia.*

commemoration of some Saint came besides: what thereto haue you to replie?

But say you, S. Basil saith, We Communicate, he saith not, We say Masse. what then? what conclude you? Of two things that be not contrary, he y^e affirmeth the one, denieth not the other. we say he did both. For if of the affirmation of the one, you conclude the denial of the other, by making this argument, he communicated, ergo, he said not Masse: you reason foolishly, besides al arte of logike, & too ministerlike. Yet nothing is so common in your whole booke, as that manner of reasoning, wherein you exclude one truth by an other truth. As if one should reason thus: S. Iewel preached to day, ergo, he said not his Service to daye, Though perhaps the conclusion be true, yet is the argument naught. For he might do both, and were he as he should be, he would do both, if his religion had any good Service at al.

Thus then we say: S. Basile celebrated, or said Masse foure times in the weeke, and at euery time receined the Communion. Many priests do likewise at this day, and no smal number is of them, who say Masse, & at the same do Communicate euery day. whether S. Basile so oftentimes receined the Communion with the people al together, and whether, if the people were not at al times so disposed, he forebare to consecrate, offre, and communicate, which is done in y^e Masse: this remaineth for you to proue, before you can iustly allege the example of S. Basil against the Masse, & against the order through out al Christes Church now bled, and these many hundred yeeres practised.

Iewel.

S. Basil saith, We do communicate foure times in the weeke. Then had they not the daily Sacrifice, vvereyday priuate Masse is grounded. He much misseckeneth him selfe, that saith, that thing is daily donne, which is done but foure times in seven dayes.

2 U

Harding.

Q. Iewel's conclusionable reasoning is, to put away one truth by y^e affirmatio of another truth.

A Reioindre to

Ieruel.

S. Basil in the same place saith thus. We do Communicate foure times in the weeke: vpon the Sunday, Wensday, Fryday, and Saturday. If we may sounde any thinge vpon wordes, he saith, We Communicate: He saith not, We say Masse. And thus saith S. Basil, we do foure times in the weeke.

Harding.

But where be the very selfe wordes of S. Basil here alleged by M. Harding, that you pretended to make for you? haue you so soone forgotten, what you promysed? I looked for the very selfe wordes, els why craked you so much of them? These were not by me alleged paroy. Yet what make they against vs? what make they for you? S. Basil saith in that epistle, we communicate foure times in the weeke, what then? He speaketh it of himselfe, and of his priuate custome: neither saith he that he communicated only foure times in the weeke, but also vpon other dayes, if y^e memorie of any Saint were kept, which you dissembled, least you should allege ought, y^e might sounde to the estimation of Saintes.

And what if we say, S. Basil meant by those wordes, that he consecrated and offered the body and blood of Christe foure dayes in the weeke, and at every time communicated, that is to say, received, as of right the Sacrifice offered ought to be received? To y^e pertectmeth the prayer, which he was wont to say at his Masse, whereof he wrote a forme. In which he praid thus. Make me O Lord meete by the vertue of thy holy spirit, that being indued with the grace of priesthode, I may stand at this holy table, & consecrate thy holy and pure body, and thy pretious blood. For thou art he that offerest, and art offered, he that takest, and doest geue, Christe our God. Now if we graunt you, that S. Basil consecrated, offered and received the Communion which he had consecrated, that is to say, celebrated or said Masse (as now we speake) foure times euery weeke, and when so euer a Saintes day, or a

*Basil in
Liturgia.*

com=

commemoration of some Saint came besides: what thereto haue you to replie:

But say you, S. Basil saith, We Communicate, he saith not, We say Masse. what then? what conclude you? Of two things that be not contrary, he y^e affirmeth the one, denieth not the other. we say he did both. For if of the affirmation of the one, you conclude the denial of the other, by making this argument, he communicated, ergo, he said not Masse: you reason foolishly, besides al arte of logike, & too ministerlike. Yet nothing is so common in your whole booke, as that manner of reasoning, wherein you exclude one truth by an other truth. As if one should reason thus. M. Iewel preached to day, ergo, he said not his Seruice to daye, Though perhaps the conclusion be true, yet is the argument naught. For he might do both, and were he as he should be, he would do both, if his religion had any good Seruice at al.

Thus then we say: S. Basile celebrated, or said Masse foure times in the weeke, and at euery time receiued the Communion. Many priests do likewise at this day, and no smal number is of them, who say Masse, & at the same do Communicate euery day. whether S. Basile so oftentimes receiued the Communion with the people al together, and whether, if the people were not at al times so disposed, he forebare to consecrate, offre, and communicate, which is done in y^e Masse: this remaineth for you to proue, before you can iustly allege the example of S. Basil against the Masse, & against the order through out al Christes Church now bled, and these many hundred yeres practised.

Iewel.

S. Basil saith, We do communicate foure times in the weeke. Then had they not the daily Sacrifice, vvereyday priuate Masse is grounded. He much misseckeneth him selfe, that saith, that thing is daily done, which is done but foure times in seven dayes.

¶

Harding.

So. Ies
Soles cu-
stomable
reasoning
is, to put
away one
truth by y^e
affirmatio
of another
truth.

A Reioindre to

Harding.

Q. It
weld wea-
ke reason.
S. Basil
Sacrifi-
ced foure
times eu-
ry weeke:
ergo the
Church
hath not
daily Sa-
crifice.

Remember you wel, what you say, and how you reasb: you are welcome home, that thus shew your selfe to acknowledge the Sacrifice. Holde you there, and go not from it againe. Truth it is, foure times in the weeke, beside Saintes dayes, S. Basil did Sacrifice and communicate. This much touching the Sacrifice you confesse, els how vaine is your obiection against the daily being of the Sacrifice? And now say for that point, what if S. Basil did Sacrifice and communicate foure times in the weeke: might not therfore other ppiestes do so at other times, and vpon other dayes of the weeke? Shal it not be called the daily sacrifice except it be offered daily of S. Basil, and so likewise of euery particular priest? Shal we not say, the bread whereof at Gods hospitall had we are daily fed, is our daily bread: if perhaps some persons through sicknesse, deuoute abstinence, or other causes, at certaine dayes abstaine from eating? Werey such weakereasons betwix the weakenesse of your cause.

Iewel.

More ouer S. Basil saith. After the priest hath once consecrate, & diuided the Sacrifice, we must thinke that we ought to receiue, and to be partakers of it accordingly. For in the Church the priest geueth parte, and the Communicant receiueith it with al freedome of conscience, and with his owne hande putteth it to his mouth. Therefore is the vertue al one, whether it be one portion onely that he receiueith of the priest, or moe togeather. *Here marke good reader, how many wayes S. Basil ouerthroweth M. Hardinges Masse.*

Harding.

Remember then I pray you, that S. Basile acknowledge the Sacrifice, which you deny. And for my part I pray thee also, marke wel good reader, what substantiall Grosse **Q.** Jewel bringeth

bringeth out of S. Basil against the Masse, as in these dayes, we haue it in the Church, which it pleaseth him to cal M. Wardings Masse.

As for this place taken out of S. Basiſes epistle to Celsaria, it is directed to the state of the questiō then treated, so as al scruple and doubt of conscience touching the receiuing of the blessed Sacrament when neither Priest nor Deacon is present, in time of persecution, might be taken from her mynde being fearful & loth to offende. wherfore we must thinke, that S. Basil in that epistle did not so much declare vnto her, what ought alwayes to be don, as in those times of persecution what was to be donne, & what might safely be donne. Neither pertaineth al that he saith, to the priest, but also and rather to the people.

After that the priest hath once consecrated and diuided the Sacrifice, we must thinke, that we ought to receiue & to be partakers of it, saith S. Basil. Thus he saith concerning the receiuing of the Sacrifice. It must be receined, and to that end it is consecrated. If it be distributed vnto the people, they may not kepe it to any other vse, but onely to receiue and consume it, and to be partakers of it. So neither at this day is the Sacrifice at any time consecrated but to be receiued, and it is receined of the priest at every Masse, and sometimes of the people in great number, and at al times, when so euer any of them be disposed and require it.

As touching the receiuing with the hand, it was the manner of y^e time. Sithens it hath ben thought conuenient, the people to receiue it with their mouthes at the priestes hande, and that for the more reuerence of the Sacrament. This is a thing so indifferent, that we thinke it not to be strined for.

Concerning the Sacrifice it selfe, whether it be (saith he) one portion only that is receined of the Priest, or moe portions toge-

A Reioindre to

ther: the vertue of it is al one. The Sacrifice is one, though it be receiued in diuers portions, and the portions carried home in time of persecution to be receiued of deuoute persons at their conuenient time, were of like vertue, as if the whole were receiued at once in the Church. We at this time haue the like faith touching these Mysteries, though we haue not cause of the like practise. But let vs see how many wayes S. Basile by M. Netwel, ouerthroweth M. Hardings Masse.

The best
reaso that
M. Netwel
can finde
in S. Basile
against
Masse.

Ieruel.

S. Basile saith, We do Communicate: M. Harding in his Masse doth not Communicate.

Harding.

With you M. Netwel, and with your sect I do not communicate. With others that be Catholique, and likewise receiue the Communion I do communicate, though we be not together the one at the others elbow.

Ieruel.

S. Basile diuideth and distributeth. M. Harding diuideth in dede, but distributeth nothing.

Harding.

Being lausful for me to take vpon me the person of a Catholique Priest making answer for al, thus I say. If others that be proued and examined, as S. Paul requireth in this case, be ready and willing to receiue: I distribute vnto them. If there be none, yet ought I to receiue that which I haue consecrated and offered: wherein I Communicate with those that receiue otherwhere. If others wil refraine, the fault (if any be) is not mine. In that case it is no reason, that I be kept from that heauenly food, which I hunger and thirst after, and in the celebration whereof according to the commaundement of Christ I render thanks to my Redeemer, and celebrate the memoie of

of his death and passion.

Ieruel.

In S. Bafiles Masse the people receiveth: in M. Hardings Masse the people receiveth not.

Harding.

Sometime the people receiveth, sometime they receive not. As when their deuotion is fervent, God is to be praised, who giveth that grace: So when it slacketh, for doing priestly dutie at Masse, I am not to be blamed. If the people growe to negligence and undevotion, through lacke of preaching and good exhortations: then am I faulty, my Masse is faultlesse, then am I to be punished, the Masse is not to be abandoned. Except you can proue, that Christs Institution is broken, for that the people at every Masse receiveth not the Sacrament with mee, which you haue attempted, and can not performe: barke no more at the Masse, seeke meanes how to amende the people.

Ieruel.

In S. Bafiles Masse eche man receiveth vwith his owne hande. In M. Hardinges Masse no man receiveth, no not vwith the Priestes hande.

Harding.

If you sing not one song, I knowe not what you meane, nor your selfe I suppose. If the hande were al that made you at variance with vs, I woulde ye had the free vse of your handes, so that due reuerence were kept. How men may receive with the priestes hande, I doo not wel vnderstande. That of the priestes hand they would oftener receive, it were much to be wished. But though the peoples deuotion now be waxen colde, in comparison of their heate, that lined daily in

A Reioindre to

fear of life among the persecutions of the Primitive Church: yet that it is no sufficient cause, why the daily Sacrifice of the Church should be abolished. Let vs not prevent Antichristes iniquitie.

Ieruel.

In S. Basiles Masse, the people besides that they receiued presently there, had portions also deliuered them to receiue at home. In M. Hardings Masse there is no portion deliuered vnto the people, no not so much as presently to be receiued in the Church.

Harding.

If the faithfull people lined in like feare of their life now, as they did then, when they prepared them selues euery day, & looked to be done to death or were like otherwise to bee persecuted for their faith, & therfore would now also be desirous to receiue in the Church, and to haue hostes consecrated home with them, that how suddainly so euer they were taken, they should not departe without that diuine viage prouision: In this case, specially order thereof being taken by publike auctoritie, such holy portions should be prouided and deliuered vnto them also to carry home with them. But nowe an other state of times, requireth an other condition of manners. If they receiue not in the Church so often as they should, lay the fault where it is: Amende your owne selfe, you shal finde lesse fault with vs.

Ieruel.

In S. Basiles Masse ech man receiueth and eateth for him selfe. In M. Hardings Masse the vvhole people eateth by the mouth of the Priest.

Harding.

what is that ech man receiuerh and eateth in S. Basiles Masse? why viter you not that is in your harte plainly? Cofse by the crummies of your Sacramentarie heresie. Is it any other by your new Gospel then Bread? If it be not bread, but the

The 123.
vnto truth.
the whole
people ea-
teth not
by the
mouth of
the Priest
as M.
Ieruel
meaneth.

the very body of Christ, into the which the bread by the almighty power of the word is converted: say so, that we may know what you mean.

210. If it be bread, as the deniers of your Gospel teach, tel us, who euer among the Catholikes said, the whole people eateth bread in the Masse by the mouth of the priest? You can neuer shew it, I am wel assured. what you haue brought in your xvij. Article touching this matter, I haue wel considered. Neither Biel, nor Vincentius de Valentia, nor Eckius, whom thereby you would faine discredite, being rightly vnderstanded, can seme to any learned man to say, that the whole people eateth the bread, or as you perhaps had here rather to terme it, the Sacramental bread, or that they eate at al Sacramentally, by the mouth of the priest. And yet that it might so seme, you haue stretched, racked, and falsified their wordes to an other sense, then euer they ment, specially in that you would the word of Communicating, to signifie none other thing, but the outward receiving of the Sacrament. These two schoolemen, and Eckius, were not so simple of witte, howsoeuer ye gospellers contemne their plaine manner of utterance in comparison of your owne painted sheath, and affected finenesse, as to speake so farre wide of reason.

And as concerning Eckius, you haue most impudently belied him, where you say of him thus. *Likewise Doctor Eckius saith, Populus bibit spiritualiter per os sacerdotis. The people drinketh spirituallly by the mouth of the priest. And then for Confirmation of the matter, you adde these wordes of credite. These wordes (say you) be plaine, and truly reported. And al is starke false. For Eckius in his common places, where he treateth De vtraque Specie, as you haue noted in the margent of your booke, hath no such wordes at al. If thou desire to know Reader, what be Eckius wordes, they be these, In sacerdotis persona totus po-*

20. Jew.
falsifieth
Biel,
Vincenti-
us, and
Eckius
in the 13.
Division.

Page 188

A Remoindre to

pulus quadam spiritali sumptione sanguine Christi bibere gaudenter debet credere. The whole people (saith he) ought gladly to beleue, that they drinke the blood of Christe by a certaine spiritual receiuing in the person of the Priest. Of the Priestes mouth he speaketh not. Yet these wordes be truly reported saith M. Jewel.

What meane you M. Jewel, thus to play the falsary, and shamelesly to lye? Thinke you to grow in credite with the world by such open lying? Is not the truth of our cause to wise mens iudgement much commended, and your whole doctrine brought into suspicion, when they see you conuicte of so many, and so manifest lyes?

Touching the thing it selfe. If it be the bodye and blood of Christe, which the Priest receiveth at Masse, as thereof we are assured by Christes owne profession: so many of the people as be in the vnitie of the Church, do communicate with him spiritually, and wyth some effecte of grace, when so euer he receiveth. That is to say; forasmuch as he and they are members of one bodye knitte and ioyned together by Faith and Charitie, euen as in a natural bodye, when one member is fully nourished, the rest also take parte of their sustenance: so when the Priest receiveth the bodye and blood of Christe at Masse, some portion of the grace, vertue, and effect thereof redoundeth vnto the deuoute people being members of the same bodye with the Priest, specially vnto such as be present at the celebration of the Sacrifice, who by vow do also offer the same: For among the faithful there is a fellowship and communion of al good thinges, as the prophete Dauid saith, Particeps ego sum omnium timentium te: I am partaker of all that feare thee.

Mat. 26.
Luc. 22.

The faithful people do spiritually communicate with the Priest, which receiveth the sacrament at Masse.

In this sense it might wel and rightly be said of those
 Divines, whom M. Jewel ignorantly and presumptuously
 condemneth, that the people doe spiritually Communicate
 with the Priest, as receiuing some effecte of grace by his
 worthy receiuing of the Mysteries. But that they eate, that
 is to say, that they receiue the Sacrament, or Communi-
 cate Sacramentally by the mouth of the Priest, as M. Jewel
 reporteth: neither Gabriel Biel, nor Vincentius de Valen-
 tia, nor Echini, whom M. Jewel allegeth, nor any other
 learned man, Scholeman or other, euer spake or wrote such
 absurditie.

But if it be lawful to prone one thing, by an other like
 thing, one reason seruing to both, I demaunde of you M. Jew-
 el, whether by S. Augustines doctrine we may not boldly say,
 that the faithful people doth receiue the Communion, in some
 reasonable and true sense, that is, spiritually and effectually,
 not Sacramentally, by the mouth of priestes, or rather in priestes,
 specially vnder the name of the Church the people being com-
 piled. For as S. Augustine saith of a man that hath receiued
 the holy ghost, whosoener he be, that he speaketh with the tongues
 of al nations, because he is one of Christs body the Church
 which so speaketh: So what reason is there, why a man may
 not say the like of the faithful people, touching the Communion?
 S. Augustines wordes be these, Si quis dixerit alicui nostru. &c
 If any say to one of vs, Thou hast receiued the holy ghost, why
 speakest thou not with al tongues? He ought to answer, I speake
 with al tongues, because I am in that body of Christ, in the church,
 which speaketh with al tongues. Tel me M. Jewel, why I may not
 as wel say of the faithful people, that they do receiue the Com-
 munion spiritually and effectually, yea though ech singular per-
 son receiue it not sometimes in his owne person Sacramentally,

M. Jewel
 charged
 with a
 fowle de-
 struty.

Howe the
 faithful
 people re-
 ceive the
 Commu-
 nion by
 that the
 priestes do
 worthily
 receiue.

Augustin.
 De tempore
 serm. 182.

A Reioindre to

*Augustin.
de tempore
Sermo.
186.*

for as much as they be in that body of Christ, to wit, the Church, which doth receiue: But in whom doth the Church receiue? In vertuous and holy priestes. For as S. Augustine saith. In some Sainctes the Church worketh miracles, in other Sainctes it speaketh the truth, in other Sainctes it kepeth virginie, in other Sainctes it kepeth the chastitie of wedlocke, in others this, in others that: so why might he not haue said, in some Sainctes, that is to say in holy priestes, the Church doth receiue the Communion, that is to say, the vertue and effect of the Communion?

*Guerricus
Abbas Ig-
niacensis
Sermone
in die Pu-
rificationis.*

Certaine vertues though al persons haue not, (saith a holy Father, whose words M. Jewel hath in this Article alleged vnder the name of S. Bernard) yet let them loue him, who hath that which they finde not in them selues: and then haue they in him, that which in them selues they see not. As Peter in Iohn hath the merite of virginie, so Iohn in Peter hath the reward of Martyrdome. Thus it may be truly said, that the godly and wel disposed people do receiue the effect, vertue, and grace of the holy Communion in their priest, by whom as by their publike minister they also offer vp the Sacrifice: but in what measure, that we leaue to Gods determination, who giveth his grace, as it pleaseth him: verely we say not in like measure, as if they receiued the Sacrifice worthily ech one in his owne person.

The .xix. Division.

Among other testimonies for single or Sole receiuing, I bring the place out of S. Hierome, in Apologia aduersus Iouinianum. where he speaketh of a custome that was at Rome, that many faithful persons receiued the body of Christe euerie

every day. which thing he neither reproveth, nor commendeth. This thing yet he thought was to be reproveth, that, whereas S. Banle would married folke for cause of prayer so forbear their carnal embracinges for a time, they of Rome refrayned not from comming to that holy table daily, notwithstanding they had done the carnal acte. And yet feeling some remorse of conscience by reason thereof, they received at home, and durst not go to Churches, specially where the Martyrs tombes were, there to receive. wherfore he appoeth their consciences that so did, whether they did wel or no. And concludeth as it were upon confession they seemed to make by their owne facts, that they did evil. For where as they had done that, for which they durst not communicate openly in Churches, they did evil to be so bolde, as to communicate at home. For (saith he) what is not lawfull in the Church, neither at home is it lawfull. The whole place is to be sene in my booke set forth at large and plainly. Certaine it is, that it containeth a witness of private Communion and of Sole receiving of Christs body, for proufe whereof it was alleged.

M. Jewel in his Replie kepeth him self a looffe of from making directe answer to the point, and discourseth at pleasure upon other maters, the discussion whereof as it requireth large treatises, and yet they be sufficiently determined by the Church, so it pertaineth not to the mater presently handled. He calleth now the private receiving of our Lordes body at home, a superstition. He reproveth S. Hierome for writing and speaking unscemely of the state of Mariage, for which, as he saith, he was driven to make his answer by way of purgation unto Hamnachins. He taketh upon him to reprove also Tertullian, and Origen for bawdous error touching Matrimonie. And as for Origen, he belitteth him sowly, and falsifieth his wordes, making him to speake otherwise then ever he wrote, or meant.

1. Cor. 7.

Fol. 20.

M. Jew.
reproveth
S. Hiero-
me to
lessen his
authority.

Origen be-
lieved and
falsified by
M. Jew.

A Reioindre to

H. Jew,
is enimie
to the
Saintes
reliques
and Mir-
acles.

He speaketh against the hynning of Martyrs bones, and misse-
liketh both the reliques and also miracles of Saintes. Then he
allegeth sayinges out of S. Paule, and S. Chrysostome in com-
mendation of Matrimonie, which no wise man dispraised. By
doing whereof he leaereth to pike a thanke of his fellow Bos-
pollers, who being Monkes, Frieres, and Priestes, bounde by
deliberate and solcme vowes to liue chaste in single life, haue
notwithstanding in pretended wedlocke taken to them selues
their yokefellowes for better oportunitie to studie, preach, and
pray, which ought to be the exercises of that vocation.

After this he cometh to Erasmus, and when he hath said
al that he could for him, he maketh him but a double man, say-
ing vpon S. Pauls wordes, haue ye not houses to eate in, one
thing in his Annotations vpon S. Hierome, an other in his
Paraphrase vpon S. Paul. Yet the plaine testimonie of E-
rasmus for sole receiuing, by no lister he could anoiue. His
wordes be these. Of this place (saith he) we gather, that in the
olde time euery one was wont to receiue the body of Christe at
home in his house, that woulde.

*Erasmus in
scholijis in
Hierony.
Apologia
aduersus
Iouinian.*

Thus is Erasmus founde to agree with me in the under-
standing of the forementioned place of S. Hierome. His chiefe
Replee to the place is this.

Ieruel.

This is not a necessary forme of reason, men receiued the Sa-
crament in their houses: Ergo, they receiued the Sacrament alone.
For they might receiue in their seuerall houses with their wyues and
families altogether, as it is already proued by the example of Hippoly-
tus Martyr. And S. Hierome saith, the Sacrament was sent hame to the
man and wyfe.

Harding.

ad. m. d. c. l. i. Harding.

I claime not Sole receiuing by a necessary forme of argumēt out of this place. I haue proued that already by a necessary forme of reason, in the example of Serapion and others. This place also of S. Hierome geueth vs a clere witness thereof, except one would cauil, as you do, and say, that the wife and familie at all times, receiued with the husband. For as it is spoken only by ghesse, and can not be proued: so is it more then probable, that if the wife and familie had at all times receiued with the good man of euery house, S. Hierome would haue disposed his saying otherwiser, then we find it written, and would haue said some what touching the seueral companies, specially if he had been of M. Jewels opinion, that the Sacrament may not be receiued, but of a Congregation assembled together in one place. Whereby whereas he saith in this place by me alleged, Probet se vnusquisq, & sic ad corpus Christi accedat, let ech man trye him selfe, and so come to the body of Christe: He seemeth not to thinke, nor to teach that a man, who hath sufficiently and duly tryed and examined him selfe, and is desirous to receiue that heavenly foode to his comfort, should not be admitted at any time to receiue, except his wife and familie be ready to come to the same place, and receiue with him. And because it standeth not with reason, that one be restrained from the fruite of his deuotion, by the case, happe, or fortune of an other: S. Hierome may iustly be thought to meane, that, if any man haue duly proued and examined him selfe, he may in Gods name go and receiue the body of Christe, whether his wife and familie be likewise disposed or no.

Let ech man proue him selfe, saith he, and so go vnto the body of Christe. what meaneth he by this worde Sic, so? Meaneth he any more, then that a man be wel tryed?

Sole receiving proued.

Hieron. in Apologia aduersus Iovinian.

This worde Sic, so, to denoted in S. Hierome.

And so, that is to say, being duly examined, let him go vnto the body of Chyriste. He is not required to tarry, vntill he gete his wife and familie also vnto him, but sic accedat, so, that is, when so euer he is wel tried and examined, let him come to receiue, saith he.

That S.
Hierome
meaneth
Sole re-
ceiuing.

And as concerning ech mans familie, which M. Jewel by his gheasse surmiserh to be a parte, to make vp his number for a Communion: the surmise is very foolish. For whereas S. Hierome speaketh onely of them, that Communicated the same day in which they had done the wedlocke seruice of the flesh: how is not the familie excluded out of that number, onlesse M. Jewel imagine the wife to be naught with the seruantes, or them also to haue women otherwise? Certainly he speaketh in that place of none other, but of such, as receiued the Communion after they had done the carnal woꝝke of wedlocke. And although M. Jewel suppose, the man neuer receiued, but when the wife receiued with him, which is a very vncertaine gheasse: yet in his iudgement is that no Communion, because there lacketh a chird.

without
threere-
ceiue toge-
ther, it is
no Commu-
nion by
the new
Gospel.

For as threere make a College, so by these mennes new founde Gospel it is no Communion, except there be threere at least in one place together to receiue.

The exam-
ple of Hip-
polytus
fatale, as
it appea-
reth.

As for the example of Hippolytus Martyr, by which you say, you haue proued the custome of the householders ministring of the Sacrament vnto his wife, children, and familie: First, we doubt of the storie. You allege no author for it. Your truth is so wel knowen, that we can not trust you farther then you shew good euidence. Perhaps we may say, it is taken out of your owne Legenda aurea. So wil we beleue, vntill you shew vs your sufficient warrant, you that be so ambitious in your blasfing Citations, should not haue left this pope example vncoted. And though it were so, yet as one swallow maketh not y springe-
ride,

side, as Aristotle saith, so neither can one singular example be alleged to proue a custome. And though Hippolytus did so in the Speke Church, what proufe is þ of a common custome in Rome?

Neither is þ to be sold expressly in Apologia aduersus Iouinianum, of the Sacrament sent home to the man and his wife, as you report it of S. Hierome. In dede this much I finde there, which liketh not you, nor your companions, I belieue. Ecce perspicue nuptias &c. Loe we haue said plainly, that Mariage is accompted lausful in the Gospel: yet the same, though it continew in his due office, can not receiue the rewardes of chastitie. Which thing if married men take greuously, let them not be angry with me, but with the scriptures: yea with Bishops, with Priestes, with Deacons, and with the whole order of Priestes and Leuites: who knowe, that they can not offer Sacrifices, if they attend vpon the wedlocke worke.

Which saying of S. Hierome I would the reader to compare with that you haue brought out of S. Chrysostome, vnto which you haue geuen a dangerous sense by your partial translation. Vse thy Mariage with sobrietie, and thou shalt be the chiefe in the kingdom of Heauen. If he shalbe chiefe in the kingdom of heauen, how is that true which S. Hierome saith, that he can not receiue the rewardes of chastitie? If the rewardes of chastitie be so great, that the state of mariage can not attaine them, how shal the married man, though he vse his mariage with sobrietie, be the chiefe in the kingdom of heauen? The virgin shal haue such reward, as he can not be admitted vnto, how then shal not the virgin be preferred before him?

S. Chrysostom saith thus to a Churche married man. Vse thy mariage with moderation, and thou shalt be first, (or rather if our tongue would beare it) a first or a foreman in the kingdom:

Al i out

More attributed to S. Hierome, then S. Hierome saith.

In Apologia contra Iouinianum.

They that attend vpon wedlocke worke, can not offer Sacrifices.

Chrysostom ad Heb. hom. 7.

The difference of S. Hierome & S. Chrysostom by right interpretation is accorded.

A Reioindre to

that is to say, one among them, that shalbe first in the king-
dom of heauen. For in that place S. Chrysostome doth allude
Mat. 20. to the saying of the Gospel, erūt nouissimi primi, the last shalbe first.
what he meaneth by the moderate vse of mariage, there he sheweth.
It is possible saith he, yea very possible for vs that haue
Ad Heb. viues, to become vertuous, if we wil. How? If hauing viues, we
Romil. 7. be as though we had none. If we take not ioye in the thinges which
1. Cor. 7. we possesse. If we vse the worlde, as though we vsed it not.

*Chief
lesson for
married mē
to become
vertuous.*

A married man doing thus, and vsing such a moderation, may be
a first or a foze-man in the kingdom of heauen. Yet state with
state compared, after the saying of S. Hierome, the rewarde of
chastitie is of higher preferment, then mariage. But let vs see
how M. Jewel replieth against that I allege out of S. Hierom,

Jewel.

*If the people did vvel, vvhv doth S. Hierome thus reprove them? If they
did it, vvhv doth M. Harding thus allowv them?*

Harding.

*What is
S. Hiero-
me reprov-
eth in
Romains
receiuing
privatly
at home.*

S. Hierome reproveth them not for receiuing the body of
Christe at home privatly: but for that they receiued after they
had done the carnal worke of wedlocke, for which they durst
not receiue in Churches, as though Christe saw not the secretes
of their conscience as wel in their private houses, as in the Churches:
and as though that which was not lausful to be donne in
Churches, yet might lausfully be donne at home. This wrong
conscience of theirs S. Hierome reproveth, their dayly commu-
nicating he neither reproveth, nor commendeth. But that
they receiued the body of Christe privatly, he seemeth in no wise to
mislike. The commendation or reprove dependeth of their
worthy, or unworthy receiuing, not of private or publike recei-
ving.

Jewel.

Jewel of the *Church* of *England* and *the* *Diocese* of *London*
 Here M. Harding interlaceth other matter of the office of wredlocke,
 the wordes of Persius the pagane poete, and the superstitious ceremonie of
 the beathens, as I take it, little pertaining vnto his Masse.

Harding.

This is utterly false. For these be not my interlacings, but
 S. Hieromes, as every man may see. whose wordes I thoughte
 necessary to set forth wholly and truly together, as he writeth,
 least I should falsifie him by clipping the sentence, which is the
 practise, of you M. Jewel now, as euer it hath ben of heretikes
 heretofore. If you blame him that mentioned Iulius the pagan
 poete, and the superstitious ceremonie, which you mislike: quarrel
 with S. Hierome, whose fault that is, if it be a fault: I shew not
 your selfe so malicious towards me, as to reprove me for that
 which is not myne, but S. Hieromes. If you could espie faultes
 in me, I perceiue of your courtesie you would not let to tel me of
 them, and al the worlde besides.

For asmuch as I see you so offended with me for translating
 this saying of S. Hierome, I thinke verily you would haue ben
 much more offended, if I had translated certaine other sayings
 of his in that very booke quite contrary both to your doctrine,
 and proceedinges. Of which this is one for example. The Apostles
 (saith he) either were virgins, or after mariage they liued in con-
 tinencie; Bishopes, Priestes, Deacons, they be chosen either vir-
 gins, or widowers, or verely after priesthod they be chaste for euer.
 what Bishops, Priestes, Deacons your sect choseth, & how chaste
 a life they lead after they be chosen: the worlde seeth, and cryeth
 out, & vpon them. Thus then what is in this Division
 specially intended, is not by this letter answered. Suchow-
 like alwayes he singeth one song. This is not private Masse.
 vpon very smal occasion he yeth a quarrel to S. Hierome,

The 114.
 In truth,
 It is not
 I that in-
 terlace
 this matter
 It is S.
 Hierome.

In eadem
 Apologia
 aduersus
 Iovinian.

as though he had vnseemly spoken against priestes mariage, and
 letting passe the principal matter, after a ministerly fashion he mi-
 nistred much impertinente talke in contempte of reliques and mi-
 racles, by alleging S. Augustine, where he complaineth of cer-
 taine abuses committed by some about dead mennes graues.
 After this to requitte S. Hierome, he bringeth in a sober saying
 of S. Chrysostome, that married men vse their mariage soberly so
 to please his married companions, and to prepare away to saue
 his own estimation, if perhaps hereafter he spide shal moue him
 so poke him selfe to a sister, which hath moued his good brethren.
 And so he maketh vp the matter with Erasmus a good honest ma-
 gistrate in his iudgement, for he spake not one word of the Masse.
 For where he saith these wordes,

The. 129.
 Alacrych.
 I say not
 so.

Thus saith M. Harding, Erasmus gathereth the private Masse out of
 the Scriptures, M. Harding is ouer quicks in his conclusions, Erasmus
 Harding.

Hereto I answer quickly, how quicke to enee I be in my con-
 clusions: M. Jewel is ouer quicke in his eyes. For looethly I
 say not so of Erasmus. One of vs twis is here founde a lyer,
 whether of us it is, let the booke be triall.

The. 20. Division.

Having before alleged many testimonies for sole receiuing,
 for which chiefly M. Jewel addeneth S. Chasles to rest in
 I adde a place out of Damascius, who writeth S.
 Agliades Pope & Martyr, ordeined, & Sacrament in whiche por-
 tion consecrated by a Bishop, should be set abode per Ecclesias,
 that

that is, among the Churches. And because Ado a learned Fa-
ther by putting these two words, Proper Hereticks, For cause
of Heretiques, into that Decree, seemeth thereby to declare, what
was purpose and intent of that holy Synode therein: I thought
I should not speake beside reason, if I said such holy portions to
have been decreed abroad, to the intent the well disposed Catho-
like people might receive the Communion after the Catholike
usage, and not communicate with Hereticks. For better un-
derstanding of that decree, I said further, the whole Churches, Churches.
not to signifie the material Churches, unto which faithful soules
are wont to resort to serve God, but the people of the Churches,
so as the Greeke word *παροικια* oftentimes signifieth. Now
this much being supposed, that this was done for cause of Here-
tiques, as Ado expoundeth the place: what may we conceive ther-
of, but that Heretiques in those places, where this was done,
bore the sway so, as the Catholique Synodes were not suffered
to do their dutie, but rather were driven away, as before we
strained from consecrating after the Catholique usage. For
els if Synodes might without any lette or trouble so have done,
what neede had it been for Synodes to make such provision, in
sending abroad those holy portions sanctified by the Consecra-
tion of a Bishop? This place the Reader may see more clearly
in my booke. The sixth of M. Iewels Replie to this, nameth
in his accustomed scoffing and surmising, that al this is but a
gheasse. He saith thus.

Iewel.

This gheasse is one of the weakest of al the rest, and therefore M.
Harding hath said it up on every side with other gheasses, that one
gheasse might helpe an other.

Harding.

First the thing it selfe is no gheasse. For it was done by
A. A. H. S. M.

A Reioindre to

381

Damasus
in Milci-
ade.

3. Milciades that blessed Martyr and Hooper about twelue hun-
dred yeares past. If you wil. demaunde my please, heare the
wordes of Damasus in Pontificali. Milciades fecit, vt oblatio-
nes consecratae per ecclesiam ex consecratu Episcopi (propter he-
reticos) dirigerentur. Milciades caused, that Hostes consecrated
by the Consecration of a Bishop, should be sent abroad among
Churches, for cause of Heretiques. which two wordes Pro-
pter Hereticos, are added by Ado, for better declaration of the
Decree. If the addition of those two wordes Propter Hereti-
cos, be hard & heauy, to the by Damasus meaning is declared, as
you haue in the note of manifold heauies which you haue
forged: it is not mine, it is the Authoys whom I alleg. Nei-
ther is there cause why you should make so light of Ado, whom

Ado a mā
in his
time of
great an-
ticipitie
same.

in that you call Docto; Ado; and say he was a late writer. He
lived about five hundred yeares past, and was Archbishop of
Trentis, of so good authoritie and estimation in his time, that
he was thought a merite man to transle betwene the two great
Quintus, Marcellinus and Hadulphus; for peace and concorde
was made betwene them, who then strived for the Em-
pire of Rome.

This
that is to
say, is
an un-
truth. For
it signifi-
eth not so.

Furthermore to increase absurdities he saith, by these wordes,
Ecclesia, to mean, not the material Church, but the people of the
Church. That it is to say in plainer termes, Ecclesia, is not a Church, but
a private house.

Harding.

Ad. I re-
reporteth
my words
vnto truly
to be the bet-
ter able to
make his
Replie.

When you tel an ablarde and foolish tale for mee, it is easy
for you to repel what you list, and you will be sure, vnto the li-
bertie you do, to make me speake so, that you neede not to stude
long for an Answer. The order of Learned men is, not to
aduerse to their adueraries such vaine vntunishes, and weak
reasons,

reasons, as your manner is, hit to set forth their sayings, as they be, with al truth. Els what praise is it, to fight with the shadowe of a man, and afterwarde to craike of victorie? falsifie not my wordes, and say your pleasure. You make me so simple, as though I knew not what Ecclesia significeth. And after that you haue vntreuely said of mee: that I make the woorde Ecclesia, to signifie not a Church, but a private house: then you besturre you, as though you hadde great advantage at mee, and make your ignorant Reader beleue, what you list.

But if the Reader, be he neuer so much addit to your side, will reade what I saye in my booke my selfe, and not what you belie me to say in your Replie: he shal find mee true, and you a forger, a falsifier, and an vntreue reporter. who saith this woorde Ecclesia, is not a Church, but a private house? My wordes bee plaine. which woorde Churches (saye I) here significeth, as the Greeke woorde $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\kappa\eta$ dooth, so as it is not necessarie to vnderstand, that the Sacrament was directed onely to the material Churches, but to the people of the Parishen. See M. Jewel, I make the woorde Churches to signifie the people, not a private house. why say you so of me then? And why haue you noted your booke in the Margent, thus, A Church by M. Hardinges iudgement significeth a private house? For shame either write not so many lyes, or geue ouer writing altogether.

For the rest, what a doo make you about the woorde $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\kappa\eta$, to no purpose, but to ostentation of Learning, and of knowledge in the Serke tongue, as though it were not openly known, by whom of Oxford you were holpen therein? And I pray you who moued any question touching the woorde $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\kappa\eta$, what it significeth? And now that you haue shewed

These be
my words
Fol. 21, a.

29. Jew-
tis lying
note in the
Margent,
Pag. 53.

AA thy your

A Reioindre to

your owne, and your frendes high knowlege therein, what haue
ye wonne by it.

Certainely I thinke, he him selfe will say, that since the Church
was ouer in peace, neither this worde Ecclesia, nor this worde Paro-
chia, euer signified a priuate house; in any kinde of Writer, or in any time.

Harding.

Haue you not yet done with your Examiner pointes?
You thinke truely of me. I say so. I confesse it, I deny not.
And who euer said otherwise? Certainly I thinke you be ve-
ry sorry, that I haue ministered vnto you so better matter to re-
plie, seeing that you make so much a doo in anouncing that,
which neither I, nor any man els euer denyed. But Sir what
Parochia meane you to speake of Parochia? who made mention of it?
why make you that a peece of your quartel? who euer saide,
that Parochia signified a priuate house? Consult againe with
your Greeke friend of Oxford. If no man spake of it, why do
you so directly obiect it? The eager desire you had to reppone
mee, carried you quite away from seeing what you wrote.
Though Parochus be founde in Cicero and Boetius, good Au-
thors of the Latine speech, yet your worde Parochia, I suppose
you finde not in them nor in any other auncient and approued
Greeke writer. That the ecclesiasticall writers of the Latine
Church haue vsed it in place of the Greeke word *ἐκκλησία*, I
denie not.

whereas yet you will not in any wise the worde Church to
signifie a priuate house, as no man would it so to signifie: This
is that I saye in my booke. If the Houses consecrated by a
Bishop were sent abroade among certaine Churches by order of
S. Milciades, and might not be openly consecrated and mani-
fested to the people by Catholike Duties, as it appeareth by the
wordes

The effect
of that I
say in my
Answer
touching
this place
of Damas-
sus.

wordes of Damascus, specially so opened by the addition of the two wordes put in by Ado: the same being sent onely to the intent they should be received: where (may we iudge) were they received, (heretikes in those partes bearing rule) but in menues houses, which in respect of Churches, may well be called private houses: Now that in those private houses, some devoute person sometime received alone, not tarrying until others were ready to receive with him, the conjecture is not unreasonable, albeit if this confirme not our matter of sole receiving sufficiently, in the iudgement of a wrangling aduersarie: it shall not, there is ynough besides.

Isriel.

This manner of sending abroad the Sacrament, was afterwards abolished by the Council holden at Laodicea.

Harding.

It is not evident that the Council of Laodicea speaketh of this manner of sending abroad the Sacrament, neither that it speaketh of the blessed Sacrament at all. It forbiddeth the Oblations that were brought to the Church, which were of diverse kindes, to be sent to other Churches for gifts and presentes, so; so both the worde Eulogia signifie, wherof I have spoken before.

The .xxi. and .xxij. Division.

What I have toynd together for a briefe conclusion of the thing which I promised to prove, that both Jewels here set a funder, and for his pleasure hath

A Reioindre to

parted it into two Diuisions. The effect of all is this, that I
 haue now brought much for single Communion; and yet more
 could bring for prouer of the same, but that I iudged this to be
 ynough. To this M^r. Jewel, who at the beginning purposed
 to reprehend what so euer I said, were it neuer so reasonable,
 and neuer so true. so replieth, as he may seme rather to weake
 his malice vpon my person, and vpon the Church of Rome,
 then to weaken the cause, which he would so saue to be ouer-
 throwen. He liueth fault with my Logike, and saith:

Jewel.

The. 124.
 Untruth.
 I pretend-
 ed not
 here to
 proue pri-
 uate masse
 principal-
 ly, but sin-
 gle Com-
 munion.

M. Harding vseth a straunge kinde of Logike. * He pretendeth Pri-
 uate Masse, and concludeth single Communion. And why might he not as-
 vvel plainly and without colour conclude his priuate Masse?

Harding.

M^r. Jewel vseth a straunge kinde of quarrelling; reprobuing
 my Logike, where I make no argument. what Logike vse I in
 this place? do I other then plainly report, what I haue saide
 what I pretended to do, that haue I done. I pretended by good
 and sufficient testimonies to proue single Communion, and that
 haue I now performed. Read the discourse who wil, he can not
 deny, but that I pretended to proue single Communion. Your
 selfe do acknowledge and confesse no lesse, toward the ende of the
 next side of your lease, where you say, I haue taken paines to proue
 that thing, to witte, Sole receiuing, and single Communion, that was ne-
 uer denied. And yet is your Sermon a witness against you, in
 which you denied it. O; heere of there you must confesse, you
 said vntuth. Thus you say, and vnsway know, and pretend ig-
 norance, colour and dissemble, slip from one thing to an other,
 and throw your selfe plaine and Godfast in nothing, but in wyan-
 gling against the truth.

That

Thus
 saith M^r.
 Jewel,
 pag 57. 10
 lines from
 the ende.
 M^r. Jew.
 in his Re-
 ply, is co-
 trary to
 M^r. Jew.
 in his
 Challenge

That I haue so largely proued single Communion, it was to good purpose. For whereas you condemned the Masse for it, and made the priestes Sole receiuing a breach of Christs Institution: now that the same is so sufficiently proued, what remaineth, but that you recant, and allow the Masse, onlesse you can shew good reason, why Sole receiuing may be good in other faithfull persons, and il in a Priest?

Touching the Church of Rome, against which the heretikes of al ages haue euer barked, of whose Bishops, Cardinals, and Priestes you say as becometh your railing wyte, that they do neither teach, nor exhort, nor comforte, nor any other parte of their duties, and that the people is careless and void of deuotion: to answer al these sclanders, it were besides our purpose, and the same I haue already answered in my cōfutation of your Apologie. Sainct Bernard, whom you allege much both here, and other where against the Prelates of that Church, reprehendeth their euil life, he condemneth not their doctrine. As for your Doctrine, he hath thoroughly condemned in your predecessors, Berengarius, Abailardus, Arnaldus de Bria, the Henricians, the Apostolikes, the Peterburgians, and other martins of that age.

M. Jew:
raileth at
the pre-
lates of
the church
of Rome.

*The pre-
decessors
of the
Caluists
Ag.*

The xxij. Division.

After that I haue proued single Communion, for which *M. Jewel* condemneth the Masse: I prouoke him to answer my demaunde,

Page. 22. a

How say you, say I, do you repone the Masse, or do you re-
pone the Private Masse? The rest is to be seene in my booke.

To this he answereth not directly: But sheweth his wisednes.

Hitherto M. Harding hath brought Doctors without reason: now
he bringeth reason without Doctors. *Irrell*

Harding.

The Doctors I bring, had good reason. They are auncient
and learned. Who tryeth out a doubtful matter by testimo-
nies of such Doctors, he doth that which learning requireth.
The reason that now I bring, is concluded out of the Doctors;
and therefore I bring it not al together without Doctors. But
this cannot answereth not my question: I would your answer
were plaine; then should you soone perceine, what I would
conclude.

Marke wel good Christian Reader, and thou shalt see, how hand-
somely M. Harding conuinceth and shifeth his handes to deceiue thy sight.

Marke
reader, I
haue for-
borne his
th rto
(saith he)
the proufe
of private
Masse, he
saith he wil
terh me
with it.

First he hath hitherto forborne both the name, and also the proufe of Pri-
uate Masse, and only hath vsed the wordes of Sole receiuing, and Single
Communion. &c.

Harding.

I haue before proued Sole receiuing or Single Communi-
on out of the Doctors, not to deceiue the sight of the Reader,
but to proue in dede thereby consequently Private Masse, (not
as it is commonly said, but) so farre as it is a Sole receiuing on
the Priestes parte. Now it remaineth for you to shew, as I
haue before expressly required you, why it may not alwel be
lawful for a Priest to receiue alone, hauing none disposed to re-
ceiue with him, as it was and is for lay persons to receiue alone
in time of sicknesse or otherwise, hauing none also disposed to
receiue with them.

Marke.

Make good Reader how M. Jewel contradicteth him selfe. Here he saith, I haue hitherto forborne the name, and also the prouise of priuate Masse. And what hath he borne there in hand thorough out his. 17. 18. and. 19. Diuision, but that I went about to proue priuate Masse? wherfore hath he so scoffed at me al this while, but for that he would me to seme to proue priuate Masse? whose wordes be those in the. 17. Diuision? To proue priuate Masse in the primitiue Church, for lacke of priestes he allegeth Tertullians voise, certain women out of Cyprian, and Serapions boy. &c. Yet now he saith I haue forborne to proue priuate Masse. How squareth this together? It is you M. Jewel, whom the Reader hath good cause to mistrust, least by vsing such craft, and shifts, such doublenesse, such contradiction, and skipping from one thing to an other, you deceiue his sight.

M. Jew.
contrary
to himself.
I mainte-
fest con-
tradiction.

M. Jewels
wordes.

What meaneth this, that priuate Masse, and Sole receiving be so suddenly grooven in one? Surely M. Harding wel knoweth, that the nature of these wordes is not one. Neither who so euer receiveth alone, doth therefore of necessity say priuate Masse. This suddenly altering of termes may breede suspicion.

Harding.

As for the Catholikes, they acknowledge in dede no priuate Masse at al, as Luther and the Protestantes of our time vnderstand priuate. In which sense being taken I refuse the terme utterly, and retourne it backe to Luthers schoole, and to you in that point his scholar. But if you meane by priuate Masse nothing els, but the priestes Sole receiving, as sometimes you seme to meane: then may you wel iudge, that by how many testimonies I haue proued Sole receiving, by so many I haue proued that you cal priuate Masse to be lawfull. For if it be lawfull in an other, why is it not lawfull in a priest?

A Reioindre to

If you will dispute orderly hereof, it behoueth first you agree with vs vpon the terme. That which you cal private Masse, you may better cal it private or Sole receiuing. As for the blessed Masse, we know what it is, though ye blaspheme it neuer so wickedly. The Masse and private touching the Sacrifice can not grow into one. As that which is common and publike can not be private.

Ierrel.

To the Sacrifice of the Crosse, the Sacrifice that is imagined in the Masse is mere iniurious.

Harding.

Thus saith M. Jewel, but he proueth it not. It is easie for such a spirit to blaspheme. And yet doubtlesse he beareth witness against his owne conscience. For whether the Sacrifice of the Masse be iniurious to the Sacrifice of the Crosse, him selfe could haue called S. Augustine to recorde, who hereof among other many the like sayings saith thus. Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, & tamen in Sacramento non solum per omnes paschæ solennitates, sed omni die populis immolatur. Was not Christe once sacrificed in him selfe? And yet notwithstanding he is sacrificed in a Sacrament for the people, not onely through al the feastes of Easter, but also every day. Again in an other place he saith. Cuius rei Sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesiæ Sacrificium. Christe would the daily Sacrifice of the Church (wherby he meaneth the Sacrifice of the Masse) to be a Sacrament of his Sacrifice vpon the Crosse. And in an other place speaking of the Masse plainly. Israel secundum carnem seruiebat in umbris Sacrificiorum, quibus significabatur singulare Sacrificium, quod nunc offert Israel secundum Spiritum. Israel that was after the flesh serued in shadowes of Sacrifices, by which the singular Sacrifice was signified,

which

*Augustin.
epist. 23.*

*De ciuit.
lib. 10.
cap. 20.*

*Aug. contra
aduersarium
legis & prophet.
lib. 1.
cap. 20.*

which now Israel that is after the spirit offereth. This singular Sacrifice now offered up by the Church the spiritual Israel, can be understood to be no other Sacrifice, then that of Christes body, which (as S. Augustine there a litle before saith) he gave upon the Crosse for al the olde Sacrifices, & now the church offereth in the Masse through al the worlde.

This is the faith of the Church, this is the doctrine of the Fathers; by this Sacrifice christen people be put in mynde of their redemption. Of this Sacrifice is the expresse commaundment of Christe. From Christe to the Apostles, from the Apostles to their scholars, from succession to succession this Sacrifice hath spred; and shal remaine in the Church for ever. Cease M. Jewel to cal the Sacrifice of the Masse inurious to the Sacrifice of the Crosse. One and the same can not be inurious to it selfe. If you contemne the Church, yet thinke it good, to aduertise the Christen reader of the state you stand in, as al others of your wicked opinion, by this sentence of the Tridentine Councel. If any say, that blasphemie is done vnto the most holy Sacrifice of Christe donnevpon the Crosse by the Sacrifice of the Masse: or that this is derogatorie to that: be he accursed.

Your other talke in this Division toucheth me, and not the mater, and therfore I omit it.

Mat. 26.
Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11.

Council.
Tridentini
Session. 22.
can. 4.

Div. xxiiij. Division

AS in the Division before this M. Jewel founde faultes, by saying things impertinent, and would not directly answer my demaunde: so neither here can he be induced to answer the argument which I make.

To thintent the Reader may the better consider it: I shal not let
here to rehearse it againe.

If the priuate Masse in respect onely that it is priuate after
Luthers meaning, be repponeable, it is for single Communion,
that is to say, for that the subject receiveth the Sacrament alone.
But the single Communion is lawfull, yea good and godly:
Ergo, the priuate Masse in this respect that it is priuate, is not
repponeable. If the first proposition of Maior seme to be of you
to be denyed, then must you shew, for what els you reppone pri-
uate Masse in respect onely that it is priuate, then for single Com-
munion. If you shew ought els, then do your digresse from our
purpose, declaring your selfe to reppone the Masse in general.

The minor, or second proposition you can not deny, forasmuch
as I haue before so sufficiently proued it. And so the Masse in
that respect onely it is priuate, is to be holden for good and godly.
Now let Mr. Jewels answer hereto be viewed and consi-
dered.

And so to conclude your first obiection: Jewels answere vnto the same, as
the 117. Antruch. I gather not this
fond con-
clusion, it
is Mr.
Jewels,
forberie.

And so to conclude your first obiection: Jewels answere vnto the same, as
the 117. Antruch. I gather not this
fond con-
clusion, it
is Mr.
Jewels,
forberie.

And so to conclude your first obiection: Jewels answere vnto the same, as
the 117. Antruch. I gather not this
fond con-
clusion, it
is Mr.
Jewels,
forberie.

The Priuate Masse is single Communion :

Single Communion is lawfull :

Ergo, Priuate Masse is lawfull :

This Syllogismus vnto the vsfull may seme somevvhat terrible, as
a visard vnto a childe, that can not indge what is vwithin it. But M.
Harding, that made it, knoweth it is vaine, and dooth nothing.

Harding.

Mr. Jewel requireth simple, plaine, and sincere handling.

The Syllogismus (for so you call it) y^e here you haue made, how terrible it is to fooles, I know not: certaine I am to wise men it shal appeare but a counterfeit visage. Whye it is not, as you know: therfore may you take it vnto you againe, and make the best of it you can. what, thought you that noman would veme my sayinges, and vnderstand, whether I made such a reason or no? If you thought so, you were very simple. If you thought otherwise, in doing as you haue donne, you were very impudent. Is it maruel, that you falsifie the Doctours that lyued so lōg sythens, seeing you falsifie the sayinges of your lyuing aduersaries?

Now seeing my argument was farre otherwise, and not as you frame it. Both my booke, and your owne booke, into which for some colour of a confutation you haue put my wordes, is a witnesse against you, and to al that read it, declarerh your impudent falsifying. Answer it, if you can. By changing my reasons, and by setting forth such false visardes, what do you els, but tel the world, your cause is desperate, and that you haue noe what to answer? Now that you haue taken this libertie vpon you to deuyse argumentes of your owne, and say, they be myne: what maruel is it, if to the simple you seme to haue the better syde: specially if any be so simple, or so farre addit vnto you, as wil beleue what so euer you say? For you wil be sure to frame your forged reasons so, as you may be wel able to confute them. I haue told you heretofore els where, but I see no amendment.

I nede not to reuerse my argument again. Werke it, consider it wel, and answer it. what nede you to coner the light of the mater with so many vaine argumentes of your owne forgery, and with making so much a doo with *Medius terminus*, *subiectum*, and *predicatum*, points vnknotwen to the common readers: whiles you geue others warning to be ware of deit, you vse al deceit your selfe. The whole demandar of your

29. Iew.
forgeth
peruious at
guents
of his own
& attribu-
terh the to
his aduer-
uerfarie.

A Reioindre to.

shiftes sheweth, how little able you are to answere my reason. Yet
let vs heare your most serious and chiefe answer.

Ierrol.

Now touching M. Hardinges Syllogisme, thou maist see, that the
Minor or second proposition is not true, as they term it *Simpliciter*, and without
exception. For the single Communion was neuer so taken for lau-
ful, but only in consideration of circumstances, and cases of necessitie. Which
cases being either remoued, or better examined, the same kinde of single
Communion is no longer thought lausful.

Harding. The second proposition of my argument is this, Single
Communion as you terme it, or rather sole receiuing, is lausful.
This proposition say you, is not true *Simpliciter*, and without
exception. It is true say I *Simpliciter*, and without exception, for
sole receiuing is lausful *Simpliciter* and absolutely, ergo the second
proposition is true simply and without exception. Thus I proue
it. It is *Simpliciter* good, ergo it is *Simpliciter* lausful. For to
what thing so euer no parte of his substance wanteth, the same is
simply good in his kind. But to sole receiuing of the Communion
nothing wanteth on the behalfe of the thing it selfe, therefore it is
in it selfe good and perfect, so lausful simply, & without exception
& al relation to your circumstances & cases of necessitie. And thus
is the pite the sole receiuing proued, which you denie: but of your
owne aueritie, without scripture, Doctor, Counsell or reason, &
contrary to the custome and aueritie of the Church, & contrary
to the determination of the Tridentine Council, you denie it.

And if sole receiuing were lausful only in consideration of cir-
cumstances, & in cases of necessitie where as you say: your part
had ben to haue proued, that these circumstances and cases, were
of the substance of the thing, which because you were not able to
doe, you did poticely to passe it over in silence. If it were lau-
ful

Edicil. Tri-
det. Sess. 13
can. 10. &
Sess. 22.
can. 8.

ful in consideration of circumstances and cases of necessitie, then was it not contrary to gods lawe. For what so ever is absolutely contrary to gods law can be made lausful by no circumstances, nor cases of necessitie to be appointed by man. As for example, fornication is contrary to Gods lawe. were it so that a man might be in case to dye through some kind of disease, except he have carnal doing with a woman: In this case life is a thousand tymes to be lost, rather the fornication is to be donne, because it is contrary to Gods law. Again, by Gods law no man can baptise him self. Therfore no circumstance nor case of necessitie can be devised, in which a man may minister baptisme to him selfe. Forasmuch the as you confesse that sole receiuing was lausful in consideration of circumstances & cases of necessitie: you acknowledge & graunt it not to be absolutely contrary to Gods lawe. If it be not absolutely contrary to Gods lawe, then the Church assisted with the spirit of God, may take order therein, as it is sene most behooful for Gods honour. And so it hath taken order, that a priest, if the people be not disposed to receiue the Sacrament with him, may notwithstanding say Masse, and receiue alone.

And notwithstanding the Church suffereth a woman (whereof you speake) in cases of necessitie to baptise, because baptisme is a Sacrament necessarie to salutation, whereas there is no such necessitie of the Communion but that a man may be saued without it, hauing no contempt of it: better it is neuer to receiue the Communion, then to receiue it in any such case, wherein it should not be simply and without exception good and lausful.

This then is that I say. Due to receiue the Sacrament alone, it is simply and absolutely lausful in it selfe. If any person offered in receiuing alone, it is not because he receiuech alone, but because otherwise he receiuech unworthely. Consider in what cases of necessitie a woman or a lay man may baptise

A Reioindre to

at home, in the like cases of necessitie they may baptise also in the Church. In like manner if sole receiuing be lausful at home, as you confesse, in cases of necessitie: it is lausful also in the like cases of necessitie to be donne by the priest in open Church. The thing it selfe which lay persons do in baptizing is not vnlawful in it selfe, for if it were, they myght nowhere baptise.

Right so to receiue the Sacrament, it is absolutely and simply lawfull in it selfe, and without exception: for els it were utterly vnlawful. wherein soeuer a man offendeth when he receiue, that concerneth circumstance of some order appointed by the Church. But there is no order taken by the Church, that forbiddeth a man to receiue alone: yea rather order requirerth in some cases a man ought to receiue alone, by which order & priest at Masse is bound to receiue alone, if none els be disposed to receiue with him. Therefore Single Communion is absolutely and simply lausful.

Ieruel:

The 118.

Truth:
I brought
not thole
examples
to proue
Masse by
the direct-
ly, but sole
receiuing.

Therefore thou maist thus say to M. Harding how say you: for? Do you allowe the examples that you haue brought, to proue your Masse by, or do you not allowe them? If you allowe them, why then suffer ye not women to carie home the Sacrament, and to kepe it in cheastes, and napkins as they did of olde? If you allowe them not, because they were abuses, why then seeke you to proue your Masse by the same, and so to establish one abuse by an other?

Harding:

Q. Jew.
sustei-
ning the
parte of
an answerer
opposeth,
which in
adversary to
aliquid by
der of
schoolers.

Although it be besides the course of an orderly disputati-
on, contrary to the manner of schoolers, for the respondent whose parte
you susteine, specially when he is biged with an argument him
selfe, to oppose the opponent, and to put him to the office of a
respondent: yet least your question should seme to the vnlawful
to haue more pith and substance, then it hath in dedebus I an-
swer. The examples which I brought not to proue the Masse by

as

as you say, but to proue the Sole receiuing of the Sacrament, which you cal priuate Masse: I allowe as good and laudable for that time. The cause why we suffer now women to carry home the Sacrament, and to kepe it, as they of olde time kepte it, is, for that the Church now hath no such custome, but contrary wille commaundeth the holy hoste receiued in the Church, forthwith to be consumed, and not to be carped home. Of that order it hath good reason and consideration. For whereas of olde time it was carried home to be receiued at times when they might not safely assemble them selues together for feare of the Infidels, vnder whom they stode in feare daily of persecution to death: now that feare ceasing, the custome of carrying it home is restrained. That custome being a thing indifferent, the Church hath authority for diuersitie of times and manners to alter, as in other things of them selfe indifferent, it hath the like authority to dispose so or so, as occasion semeth good. For this cause and also for the auoiding of certain abuses therein committed in old time, the Church doth not now allowe custome of carrying home the blessed Sacrament, not because it was an abuse, as you would vs to graunt: for at that time so to doe, it was a godly vse, and no abuse. And it may so be done now also of faithful persons, where Antichrist or any of his do since the like persecution.

Iewel.

* That it might seme laudful for a Priest to say priuate Masse, he hath brought in examples of Late men, Vnemen, Sicke folke, and Boyes. Alas doth M. Harding thinke, it was the manner in olde times, that saye people should saye Masse? Or was there no Priest at this while in the world for the space of sixe hundred yeares, that women and children must come forth to praye those matters? Or was there no difference then betwixt Sole receiuing, and Priuate Masse? Or shall we thinke that women and boyes did then consecrate the holy Mysteries, or offer up Christs Body: or make Sacrifice for quick and dead: or applie Christs death

why the Sacrament is not carryed home from the Church now, as in olde time.

The. 119.
In truth.
It is not so. I brought those examples in for proufe of single receiuing.

A Reioindre to

unto others? Where is M. Hardings Logique become? Where is the
sharpeness of his wit?

Harding.

What do you say. I wel but deceive the vnlerned Reader
with confusion of termes? You seeke not truth, but only to seme
to gene your Adversarie a foile. You triumph wantonly with-
out cause. You make a wit, as though I had quite forgotten my
Logique, & lost my witte. Al these busy bragges, be but wind.
To answer your matter, if a due distinction of Masse, private Masse,
and Single Communion or sole receiuing, be considered, these
pusses of vaine wordes will soon be laid. I haue not brought in
examples of late men, women, sick folke and boyes (wherewith
your shamelesse vanitie hath neuer done, for I bring no exaples
of any boyes sole receiuing at al) that it might seme lawful for a
Priest to say private Masse. I neither acknowledge I (as the
Masse improperly the Sacrifice of the Church) any private Masse
at all, such as may be said by a Priest. If you will nedes haue the
Priests sole receiuing to be termed a private Masse, who can let
you? Surely I saue is not that which is said, but a thing which
is done. And that this thing might seme lawful in a Priest, the
foresaid exaples may wel be alleged for proufe.

That
which is
said by the
Priest is
not priuat
Masse.

Shew vs what you meane by private Masse, and what dis-
ference you make betwene private Masse and sole receiuing, and
then may you talke more directly and more plainly. For lacke
of a due distinction of it from al that is not it, and of a clere defi-
nition of the terme, you skip in and out vncertainely, and with
your confused Sophistrie deceive the simple. Crye out no more
alas, so foolishly. Scoffe no more, as though I made lay men
women, boyes, and sick folke to say Masse. How so euer you
perswade your penitentes, wise men will not beleue it of me. Be
not

not so luffy in making your triumph before the victorie. By this you do much discredit your selfe and your cause. Let vs haue lesse of your boyish mockeries, and more substance of good and learned reasons. If you haue no better stuffe then this, remember who hath chalenged you for his prisoner. I trove the chiefe comfort you haue is this: Though you be found reasonlesse and witlesse, yet you wil not be founde conglasse and sprachelesse.

The. xxv. Division.

Among other things that I speake of in the. xxv. Division, hauing shewed the Masse not to be repprouable, for that the priest receiue it alone: I adde therunto an especiall obiecti-
on, whereby I commend the peoples deuoute and worthy recei-
uing with the priest. My wordes be these. I denie not, but
that it were more commendable, and more goodly on the Chur-
ches parte, if many wel disposed and examined, would be par-
takers of the blessed Sacrament with the priest.

I repute mee to thy conscience Christian Reader, as be-
fore God, whether these wordes can iustly seeme to concerne
in any respect an end meaning. I weigh them, well, and haue
wherein I am to be repproued: say so say they. If no euill can be
proued out of them, consider with thy selfe, whether my Jewell,
who matter so much, do touch me for them, slight too to be ta-
ken for such a one, as deserveth rather to be pained me maliciously,
then to see forth the truth plainly. What goe I, euen now I
say againe, and upholde it to be well said. Wherein I confesse, it
were more commendable in the peoples behalf, that they would
dispose them selfe worthily to be partakers of the blessed

Sacrament with the Priest: he compareth me with the picture of Jezebel, in whose face a Painter by his skill of painting made two contrary affections to appeare, cruel furie stirring her to kill her childe, and noetherly pittie mouing her to spare her childe.

The. 130.
In truth.
I deface
not the
Communion
but make
it a neces-
sary parte
of y^e masse.
But I
meane not
the new
Geneuan
Communion.

Such two contrary affections (saith he) we may here see in M. Harding, both painted and sette out in one face. For notwithstanding for his credites sake he aduance his Masse, and * deface the holy Communion with al that he is able: yet here againe for conscience sake of the other side he confesseth, that the Communion is the better: and so rippeth vp al, that he hath serued before. Goddes name be blessed, that is thus able to force out his truth, euen by the mouthes of them, that openly withstand his truth.

Harding. **A** Jewel seeketh nothing els, but to carve, and re-
proue, what so euen I say: consider I pray thee good Reader,
whether it may be gathered out of my wordes, that I make the
holy Communion, which **A** Jewel speaketh of, better then the
Masse. **A** Jewel I make no comparison betwene them. I
knowe that Consecration serueth to the Communion. And
the Sacrifice that is Consecrated, is to this ende Consecrated,
that the Oblation done, it be receiued: which whether it be re-
ceiued of many groue in one place together, or of the Priest a-
lone: it is truly named Communion, because thereby the per-
son that receiveth, is ioyned to God, and made one body with
Christe, and one with al others, that be likewise partakers of the
same Sacrifice. For that hath my Sacrifice is one, as **S. Chrys-**
ostome and other ancient Fathers teach, not diuers Sacrifices,
in how many places, and of how many persons so euer it be re-
ceiued: **A** Jewel I make no comparison betwene them. I
knowe that Consecration serueth to the Communion. And
the Sacrifice that is Consecrated, is to this ende Consecrated,
that the Oblation done, it be receiued: which whether it be re-
ceiued of many groue in one place together, or of the Priest a-
lone: it is truly named Communion, because thereby the per-
son that receiveth, is ioyned to God, and made one body with
Christe, and one with al others, that be likewise partakers of the
same Sacrifice. For that hath my Sacrifice is one, as **S. Chrys-**

The hoste
of Sacri-
fice is one
euer
where.
Chrysost.
in Epist.
ad Heb.
hemil. 17.

as he and they be one, which the word Communio reporteth. This Communion is a parte of that which we call the Masse. And there is no Masse without Communion, because it is required to the perfection of a Sacrifice, that it be consumed: and therefore the Priest that consecrateth and offereth, is bounde to receive the Oblation. Therefore if I say, that the Communion is better then the Masse, I should indiscretely say, that parte were better then the whole.

Now I speake not of the goodnesse of the one, nor of the other, much lesse by a foolish comparison make I the one better then the other. The comparison that I make, is between the worthy receiving of many with the Priest, and not receiving, whether many receive with the Priest in the same place, or none receive with him: yet in that he receiveth, there is a Communion. In deeds I confesse, it were more commendable & more godly on the peoples parte, if many wel disposed and examined would receive the blessed Sacrament with the Priest. That is to say, it were more commendable and more godly for many to be wel disposed, and to enjoy that inestimable benefite, then through unworthynesse & indignation to lacke it. How be it they do not altogether lacke it, that do spiritually Communicate. In effect the sense of my saying is this. It is a more commendable and godly thing on the peoples behalfe, worthily to receive the Communion with the Priest, then the Priest to receive alone.

Marke my wordes, on the peoples behalfe, on the Churches parte. By which I exclude al comparison between Communion, and Communion. The Communion of the Priest lacking a number to receive with him in the same place, is as wel a Communion, and as good a Communion in it selfe, as if a great number received with him. It is not number more or

A Reioindre to

lesse, that increaseth, or diminisheth the goodnesse of the Communion in it selfe. Say not therefore M. Jewel, that I confesse, the Communion to be better then the Masse, that is to say, parte better then the whole, or that one Communion is better then an other Communion.

If M. Jewel means by this terme, *the holy Communion*, that is not denied to y, which hath ben inuented by our English Gospellers of the Sacramentarie secte of late yeres, and with terror of the sword commaunded to be practised, which is both Schismatical and Heretical, and tendeth directly to the condemnation of the Catholike Church: he be wel assured, that I beare not that affection to it, which he would his vnlearned followers to thinke me to beare, neither confesse I at al for conscience sake, as he buttuly reporteth of me, that it is better then the Masse. But contrarywise I confesse that it is vnderly to be detested as wicked in the sight of God, and punishable: and that if any man suffer death for not subscribing, committing, or yelding vnto it, he dieth a Martyr, and shal enioy therefore the crowne of Martyrdome. Say no moze therefore M. Jewel, that I haue ripped vp al that I haue sowed before. My scame countreweyth whole, as before. So may you recant and crosse out the note you haue put in your booke's margent. M. Harding confesseth, that the Communion is better then his Masse. which note is false, slanderous and absurd, as I haue now declared.

And for if occasion were offered me to speake honorably of the holy Communion, in case I should much commend it, and praise it, as it is worthy of al praise: would you beare the simple people in hande, that for conscience sake I said much good of your English Communion? No for, if I speake ought in praise of the Communion, perswade your selfe, that I meane not your new deuile, about the which ye were neuer yet wel agreed with-

within your selves; but of the Communion of Christs Catho-
like Church, which is farre different from your new framed
fancy.

Our Communion hath the Real body of Christe, your Co-
munion after your owne Doctrine hath but bakers bread, and
is not made a holy thing in it selfe, but the signe only of a holy
thing. We take bread and wine mingled with water after the
example of Christe, and pronounce the wordes of our Lord ouer
them, with intention to do that which the Church doth, by
which wordes spoken by the Priest in the person of Christe, his
body and blood are Consecrated. Ye take not the bread, but let
it lye on the table, whyles the Minister is talking in the pulpit,
or other where; wherein ye follow not the example of Christe, nor
put ye water to the wine as Christe did, nor haue that intention
which the Church hath; and therefore pronounce not the wordes
to such purpose as the Church teacheth, but only reade them,
as one would tel a tale, not directing your mynde and intention
to the Consecration. we adore that is Consecrated, as being the
very body and blood of Christe: ye adore not, heluing al to be
but worldly creatures of bread and wine. That which we re-
ceiue at our Communion, is before offered, as we haue ben taught
of our Lorde, who as S. Irenus saith, taught vs the new Ob-
lation of the New Testament. Ye make no such Oblation, nei-
ther beleue ye any such Oblation to be made at al.

To conclude by our Communion worthily receiued, we
are ioyned to God, and made one with Christe, and within our
selves by a natural vniou, as our of S. Hilarius and Cyrillus
I haue before declared. Ye by your Communion are the more
separated from God, sundryed from the mystical body of Christe
the Church, and the nearer ioyned to Satan the enemye of
God, author of Division,

The diffe-
rence be-
tween the
Communi-
on that
is in the
Walle, &
the new
ministering
Communi-
on.
Cyprian. ad
Casilium.

IN THE NAME
OF THE FATHER
AND OF THE SON
AND OF THE HOLY
GHOST

Irenaeus.
lib. 4.
cap. 32.

This considered, you see *Mr. Jewel*, how little cause you haue to say, that I confesse your Communion to be better then the Masse, wherewith we haue the true Communion, though the number of receiuers together in one place be not sometimes equal to the numbers of your Congregations.

Themas
is impug-
ned, not be
cause of
Quakers
Sole re-
ceiuing
chiefly, but
for the Sa-
crifices
take, whi-
che Satan
most of al
hateth.

And where as ye professe such hatred and hostility against the Masse, & without al example of antiquitie cal it by a strange name *Private*, for that the Priest, though neuer so much without any his default receiueth the blessed Sacrament alone: what if it may be brought to passe, that some shal alwaies receiue it with the Priest: wil ye then allow the Masse? As for example, at Easter, and at certaine other feastes, the people were wont to receiue their rites in England, in these countries here, and in other places, they receiue oftentimes. In this case what say you of the Masse? If this be obserued, wil the Masse then like you? If neither then ye wil allow the Masse, as doubtlesse ye wil not: then cloke the matter no more with the name of *Private Masse*, but openly professe your selues enemies to the Masse, in your railing booke and Sermons spie out your malice, at the Masse, at the mystical Oblation of the body and blood of Christ, at the daily Sacrifice of the Church. For most certaine it is, how many to euery of the deuoute people receiue their rites with the Priest, neither ye, nor Satan for al that wil allow the Masse.

where I say in this Division; As touching the substance of the Masse it selfe, by the single Communion of the Priest in case of the peoples coldnesse and negligence, it is nothing impaired: *Mr. Jewel* understandeth fault with the manner of my licence, and lieth not these new forged termes (as he termeth them) of Substance and Accidentes in the Institution of Christ. So he calleth it, for he hath a Conscience to cal it by the name of Masse,

Wasse, but when he either scoffeth, or raileth at it. Now I call so much of the Wasse by the name of Substance, as is necessary by Christes Institution, and expresse commaundement. As for the terme of Accidentes, I vse it not. If I did, I might seme to do it not without reason, vnderstanding thereby that, which we haue of the institution of holy Fathers, and is commaunded by the Church to be donne for the more reuerence of the blessed Sacramēt, for encrease of deuotion, for the better and more truly setting forth of Christes Passion, &c. M. Jewel hereto replieth thus.

Terril.

This difference in termes of Substance, and Accidentes in Christes Institution, is newly sounde out, and hath no varrant neither of the scriptures, nor of the olde Fathers.

Harding.

Why sicke you so much at the difference in termes, seeing that ye haue a difference in thinges? Did not Christ at his supper certaine thinges, that must be done of vs necessarily? Did he not certaine other thinges, which we are not bounde necessarily to follow? What if we say then these be of the Substance of Christes Institution, these be but accidentary: shal we be reprobued of gay theopicians for vsing that difference in termes? Concerning the Sacrament of Baptisme, that the body be baptized or touched with water, that the partie which baptizeth say, I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost: be not these necessary, and of the Substance of Baptisme? Other Ceremonies from the Apostles time to this day vsed generally in the Church, until that ye wish manifest contempt of the Church abolished them: be they not in comparison of the essentials, accidentarie?

DD 19.

Thus

Difference of thinges is to be vttered with difference of termes.

A Reioindre to

Thus in al Sacramentes there is a difference in thinges, and therefore to expresse the same, we may lawfully vse the difference in termes.

Iewel.

Christes example in doing, and commaundement to do the same, may not be taken for a shewe or Accident, but for the effecte and substance of his supper. Do this saith Christe, the same that you haue sene me doo: Take, blisse, break, Diuide, in my remembrance. &c. This is no Accident or light fantasie, that may be leaste at our pleasure, but the very substantial point of the Sacrament, which vs are specially commaunded to continue vntill he come. &c.

Harding.

Chc. 131.
In truth,
Christes
whole exa-
ple, is not
of the sub-
stance of
the Sacra-
ment.

Mat. 26.

Mr. Jew.
swaungeth
and much
abuserth
Scriptures

Speaking
of the insti-
tution of
the Sacramē,
he leaueth
out the co-
secration.

Yea Mr. Jewel? How handle you the Scriptures? How abuse you that most holy Myserie? Haue we nothing els to do, but to take, to blisse, to break, and to diuide in remembrance of Christe? why expresse you not, what we must take? what ment you by huddling these wordes together? If you sought the truth, you would not haue vsed such confusion. This thing would haue ben moze plainly & moze distinctly handled. That which is of most substance of al, you thought best to leaue out, least your falsheid should be espied. Where is the special Consecration? why uttered you not the wordes, by which our Lorde consecrated his body and bloud, this is my body, this is my bloud? Be you loth to heare them? Be you afrayd, they shal confound your Sacramentarie heresie at length, as those wordes of Christ, Ego & pater vnum sumus, confounded the heresie of the Arians?

Iohn. 10.
The Co-
munion of
the Eng-
lish Con-
gregation
at Geneua
had not
the wordes
of Confe-

It is like, you are of the opinion that your companions were of at Geneua in Quene Maries time. who in the Communion of their English congregation there, leaft out the wordes of Consecration, as their printed booke is a witness thereof, least the people by rehearsal of the wordes should be moued to thinke, that there is alteration made in the bread & wine, **Hy** before you talke so confidently of this great myserie,

you

you should do wel to learne, how much, and what Christs commaundment to be done, in that he said, Do ye this in my remembrance. And where should you learne it, but of the Church the spouse of Christ, to whom he promised the holy ghost the spirit of truth? The Church teacheth you, that Christ by that he did and spake at his Supper, the due mater and minister presupposed, ordained the Consecration, Oblation, and Communion of his body: and that certaine other things be but Ceremonies, whiche Christ observed and did: and be not of necessitie either of the Sacrament, or Sacrifice, but left to the disposition of the Church, as number, time, place, &c. So that Christs example is of necessitie to be followed but in parte, not for every circumstance: For els the blessed Sacrament were not to be given to sether the to twelue, and that after supper, with other circumstances contained in his example. His commaundment is thoroughly to be done without any exception. Thus you may see, a difference betwen that which is absolutely necessary by Christs commaundment, & that which is not in such wise necessary, as depending of his example: And though the same be in dede an Accident in respect of the substance of the Sacrament, yet is it not a light fancie, as it liketh you to terme it, & may now be left at our pleasure. Neither at al be the things at our pleasure, wherein the Church hath by authentical decrees taken determinat order. Whereof I thinke it not needful to speake much in this place, seeing that I have spoken of it before, and hereafter occasion shalbe given to speake againe.

You allege Alexander de Ales, and one Humbertus, (as you say) of M. Hardinges owne Scholasticall Doctors, and yet I know Humbertus was no Scholasticall Doctor. Alexander de Ales saith nothing, as you allege him, & maketh ought either for you, or againe me. As for Humbertus cited by Cassander, who beareth his whole force against the Masse whereat the people doth not see

craton for
scare of
Transub-
stantiation.
Mat. 26.

How is
Christs
example to
be followed
touching
the holy
mysteries.

Christs
commaund-
ment is
to be done
without
exception.

Humbertus.
Cassander.

A Reioindre to

cramentally communicate with the Priest: for Cassanders sake, we may iustly suspect him. But what saith he, according to the reporte of Cassander our Adversarie? Of those three (saith he) Consecration, Breaking, and Distributio, vvhich one of them so euer is done vvithout the (two) other, it representeth not the memorie of Christe.

Truth it is. The Priest celebrating Masse, doth celebrate and represent the memorie of Christ. These three to that ende must go together. The Body which is consecrated, ought in the forme of bread to be broken, and then receiued, for that is meant by distribution. And so Bumberrus calleth it, for that it is to be geuen to as many as be proued and require it. If none be ready to receiue, the Priest may and ought to receiue alone. It is enough if he haue a wil to distribute to the people, if it be vvorthily demanded. For onlesse it be receiued, Christes memorie is not represented. If by distribution he meane, that a number be alwayes together in one place, to whom the Sacramente may be deliuered: and that except it be geuen to many to receiue and consume it together, the memorie of Christ is not represented: if this be his meaning, as I thinke verely it is not: for asmuch as it is contrary to the practise of the Church, and alleged by Cassander in this point the Adversarie of the Church, and he otherwise an obscure man: I make smal accompt what he saith.

Further more I say in this Division, that if the publike Sacrifice of the Church, might not be done vvithout a number of communicantes receiuing to the Priest in one place, soasmuch as Fathers complaine oftentimes of slackenes of people for not resorting to the receiuing to the Priests: they would haue complained somewhere in their writings of the ceasing of that, vvhich euery vvhere they cal Quotidianum & iuge Sacrificium, the Daily and continual Sacrifice. But they complaine of peoples not coming to receiue, and not of the ceasing of the daily Sacrifice: Therefore

Therefore an argument thereof may be gathered, that the publicke
Sacrifice of the Church, which we call the Masse, was at sundrie
times celebrated, when such numbers of the people to receive
with the Priestes wanted. To this M. Jewell saith.

The olde Fathers neuer complained of the ceasinge thereof, because they
knewe it could neuer cease. For the strength and vertue of Christs Sa-
crifice resteth in it selfe, and not in any diligence, or doing of ours.

Harding saith.

You answer not directly. I speake of the publicke ex-
ternal and visible Sacrifice of the Church, whereby I understand
the Masse, as you may perceiue: and you speake of the strength
and vertue of Christs Sacrifice, which, as you say, resteth in
it selfe, and not in the diligence or doing of man. But the
vertue of Christs Sacrifice should rest in mans diligence or do-
ing, it is to absurd for any man to say. Therefore your denial of it,
is more odious the necessary, as though it had euer been affirmed.
And although the strength and vertue of Christs Sacrifice, rest
not in the diligence or doing of man: yet is it by the ministerie
of man applied to man. As for example, the vertue of Chri-
stes Sacrifice and passion, whereby we are redeemed, is imparted
vnto vs in Baptisme, and in Baptisme we put on Christ. And
Baptisme is ministered by man.

But concerning the ceasing of the Sacrifice which I speake
of, what though the strength and vertue of Christs Sacrifice on
the Crosse rest in it selfe, might not the old Fathers neuertheless
complaine of the Churches publicke Sacrifices ceasinge? How
hangeth your reason together? Think you perhaps there is
no such publicke Sacrifice, that may cease? How say you to the
prophecie of Daniel? Saith he not speaking of the coming
of Antichrist, that when he shal come, the continual Sacrifice

Dan. 12.

EE 1 Hal

A Reioindre to

shal be him be taken away, Per tempus, tempora, & dimidium temporis, that is, by the space of three peares and a halfe, as many understand is

What is the continual Sacrifice, which according to the saying of Daniel shalbe taken away for a time.

Of what Sacrifice can this be taken, but of the publique Sacrifice of the Church commonly called the Masse? First as touching the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Crosse, which was made but once, and that neuer be iterated nor made void: certaine it is, that al the power of Antichrist can not take away that Sacrifice. Neither the inwarde spiritual Sacrifice of mens hearts can be take away. For the more vehement is the persecution, the more fervent and earnest is the deuotion of the Elect to offer the inwarde spiritual Sacrifices in their hartes. Being then the publique Sacrifice of the Church is such as may be taken away, as now it is taken away from Christian people in England, if it be not that of the Masse, which Antichrist shal take awaye at his comming: it remaineth, you tel vs, what other Sacrifice beside that of the Masse, you can appoint.

The 172. **Truth.** This Sacrifice of Christ on his Crosse, is called the daily Sacrifice, not for that it must be renewed every day, but for that being once done, it standeth good for al dayes and for euer. It is not so called, as you means.

Harding.

The daily Sacrifice of the Church. This haue you said more then once before, but yet you neuer proued it. Neither speake I of the Sacrifice, which was once offered by Christ on the Crosse in his owne person with shedding of his blood, but of the Sacrifice of the Church, which is celebrated in memorie of that, and is unbloudy... which is called Daily, because it is daily repeted and iterated, wherein the Sacrifice of the Crosse is represented, and the memorie

more thereof by daily recourse of this being a Sacrament of
that, is renewed. And that other Sacrifice of the Crosse, so far
much as it hath no daily recourse, can not properly be called dai-
ly, though it stand good for al daies, and for ever: no more then
his worde of the Gospel may be properly called the daily worde,
or Daily Gospel, and yet it remaineth for ever, and it standeth
good for al daies, and everlastingly. To this I have answered
before in the ix. Division.

Terrel.

It may be answered in one worde. They had the holy Communion
every day, and therefore they complained not. Howbe it neither is the holy
Communion that daily Sacrifice is false, but a memoriall of the same: nei-
ther was the Communion then ministered every day.

Harding.

So for your one word will not serve for a sufficient answer,
because the Communion which you speake of is one thing, and
the daily Sacrifice whereof I speake, is an other. But me thin-
keth your one worde is little worth, because you will not abide
by it. For as now you say it, so within two lines after you
flee from it. For how standeth this together, They had the Com-
munion every daie, and neither was the Communion ministered every day?
Had they, and had they it not every daie? Or had they it, when
it was not ministered unto them, or was it ministered, when they
had it not? If they had it every Day, how was it not mini-
stered every day? If it were ministered every daie, how had
they it not every daie? It is no marvel, if M. Terrel agreeth
no better with others, than so farre disagreed with him selfe. He
saith, and vsueth for advantage, what him listeth.

M. Terrel
is contras-
ry to him
selfe.

A Reioindre to

The xxv. Division.

In these three Divisions following. xxvi. xxvii. xxviii. prosecuting the Argument before touched, which concludeth the Sacrifice to have been celebrated, though the people forbore to receive: I allegé first S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine witnessing, that they of the East were wonte to be houseled but once in the yeare, or very seldome. Then in the. xxvii. Division, I bring in a place of S. Chrysostome affirming the same.

*In. 10. cap.
ad Heb.
Homil. 17.*

What meaneth this? saith he, The most parte of you be partakers of this Sacrifice but once in the yeare, some wise, some oftener. And this pponeth the seldome receiving of the people. Then after in the. xxviii. Division, I pprove by witnesse of S. Chrysostome, that the Sacrifice was daily offered (whereby the Masse is proved) notwithstanding that the people forbore to receive, with them that offered. His wordes be platue. Quid ergo nos? Nonne per singulos dies offerimus? Offerimus quidem. Then what do we? Do we not offer every day? Yea verely we do so.

*Ad Heb.
Homil. 17.*

Now out of all this, we may gather this Argument. In the East Church the Sacrifice was every day offered, but the people did not every day receive with them that offered: Ergo the Sacrifice was offered sometimes without such a Communion, as M. Jewel speaketh of. The first Proposition is proved by S. Chrysostome, the second by S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine. Therefore the conclusion is good. M. Jewel replie, and say, that some Deacons or Priestes received with the Priestes, when they said Masse and offered: we tel him that this is but a slender gheasse of his owne brade, and that if it had alwayes ben so, when the people forbore to receive: it should have ben mentioned in one place or other. And he ought to shew vs where

to here the Priests and Deacons were commaunded alwaies to be in a readines to supplie the peoples forbearing. If there can no mention thereof be founde, sith it is otherwise now, and that not contrary to the Scriptures, constitution of any General or provincial Councel, nor to the saying of any auncient Father: he ought to heare with us, if wee utterly reject and contemne his light gheaste. Al that M. Jewel replieth in any of these three Divisions, is not of any great weight. In this. xvij. Division he saith thus.

Irruel.

S. Augustine saith touching Private Masse. *Panem quotidianum potest accipi pro sacramento Corporis Christi, quod quotidie accipimus.* In 2. lib. de sermo. The daily bread may be taken for the Sacrament of Christs Body, which we receive every day. *S. Augustine saith, the people they received the Sacrament every day: wherof it followeth necessarily, that the private Masse was then said neuer a day.* ne dom. in monte. cap. 12.

Harding.

By private Masse you vnderstand (as I suppose) either the Masse, and Priests sole receiuing: or onely the Priests sole receiuing. If you meane the Priests sole receiuing onely, and can also proue out of S. Augustine, that the people received the Communion together with the Priests euery day: then proue you that euery such Masse was not private by the authority of S. Augustine. But if you meane by your newe founde terme private Masse, the blessed Masse it selfe, in which the Body and Blood of Christ are of the Priest consecrated, and offered vp to God the Father vnbloodily, and forthwith receiued of the Priest, hauing no others to receiue with him in the same place: of the words which you reherse out of S. Augustine, it followeth not necessarily, that the private Masse was then said neuer a day. For although some Priests received with the people, yet some

others

Chc. 133. Ministruth. S. Augustine saith not so.

A Reioindre to

others might haue said Masse, and receiued alone.

S. Augustine
misrepor-
ted by **H.**
Jewel.

But saie you, **S. Augustine** saith, the people then receiued the Sacrament euery day. You say so, **S. Augustine** saith not so. The Dailie breade may be taken for the Sacrament of Christes Body, which wee receiue euerye daye, saith he. What then? Yet wil it not follow, that the people receiued euery daye. For **S. Augustine** might meane that either of him selfe, and other Priestes as he was, or, which is moze likely, he spake and meant indefinitely of al beleuers, among whom some receiued the Body of Christe euery day. Which may be vnderstanded of the Priestes them selues, among whom some saie Masse and receiued euery day. Thus it is euident, that **S. Augustine** in that place doth not ouerthrowe the Masse, which you terme Priuate, and is Common and Publike, notwithstanding any thing that you haue said to the contrary.

Leuel.

But the Grecians custome was to receiue once onely in the yeare? Ergo the Priest at other times receiued alone.

Harding.

You neuer reporte my Argument truly. This it is?

Lib. 5. De
Sacramēt.
cap. 4.
Homil. 17.
ad Heb.

The Greekes in the East were wont to receiue but once in the yeare as **S. Ambrose** saith: But the Sacrifice was offered euery day, as **S. Chrysostome** saith: Ergo, the Priestes oftentimes receiued without the People.

Leuel.

No saith **S. Augustine**, this custome, or negligence, was not vniuersal among al the people of Grecia, but among a certaine of them onely.

Harding.

Were it that I denie not the thing it selfe, yet **S. Augustine** saith

said not as you report, that once you would his truth.

For thus he saith. Plurimi in Orientalibus partibus non
quotidie communicant. Many in the East partes do not daily com- De serm.
municate. Wherein may be well implied, that some daily did Commu- Dom. in
nicate. Otherwise the exception of many had been in vaine. monte. lib.
2. cap. 12.

Harding.

Although S. Augustine say so in that place, meaninge
of the more parte, yet S. Ambrose Lib. 5. De Sacramentis.
Cap. 4. And S. Augustine him selfe De Verbis Domini se-
cundum Lucam, Hom. 28. speake of the Greekes in the East
without exception. Of the thing I contend not. But how
holdeth your Argument S. Jewel, Many in the East partes
did not daily Communicate. Ergo, some daily did Commu-
nicate? This conclusion say you, may wel be implied. For
els the exception of many had been in vaine. Sith that you
will haue this Argument to be so good here for your purpose,
I pray you why may not the same Argument be as good for
an other purpose, that you like not? By your owne Lo-
gique you must nedes allow this Argument for good. Ma-
ny in the East Church, where the Greeke service was used,
spake not naturally the barbarous Tongues onely: Ergo,
some spake naturally the barbarous Tongues onely. Of
this Conclusion I inferre an other, Ergo, they had their
Church service in a strange tongue whiche they knewe
not. which if you graunt, you must recant your thirde Ar-
ticle.

But S^r, though the Greekes in the East, as S. Ambrose
and S. Augustine do say, did communicate but once in the year:
yet might the Priestes among them offer the Sacrifice daily,

ET III 03 vs

A Reioindre to

or very often notwithstanding. which being true, as it is true by S. Chrysostomes testimonie: then was the Sacrifice offered, and Masse celebrated, without and beside the which, the vnbloody Sacrifice is not offered, where people forbare to communicate. And so farre is the Masse proued without the peoples receiuing, which you impugn and condemne.

Ierrel.

And that in such places, vvhether the Sacrament was not daily received of the people, it was not received privately and daily of the Priest for continuance of the daily Sacrifice, as M. Harding surmisseth, it appeareth vval by sundry good records. S. Augustine saith, Huius rei sacramento alicubi quotitie, alicubi certis interuallis dierum, in Dominico preparatur, & de mensa Dominica sumitur. The Sacrament of this thing is prepared, or consecrate in the Church, and received of the Lordes table, in some places euery day, in some places vpon certaine daies.

Harding.

By three places you would proue, that, whereas the Sacrament was not daily received of the people, there was not offered daily the Dayly Sacrifice, which you had rather call the Priestes private and daily receiuing. For that the Priestes did daily offer by the vnbloody Sacrifice, you can not abide so much as to name it. Satan hateth the thing, you hate both the thing and the name. And by this you shewe your selfe to meane by private Masse, nothing els but the Priestes private receiuing of the Sacrament. For which private and sole receiuing of the Priest, there is no reason why the Masse should be called private.

But how proue you your purpose by this place of S. Augustine? The Sacrament, saith he, is somewhere euerye daye, somewhere vpon certaine dayes prepared in our Lordes table, and from our Lordes table is received. For so is the sentence truly

reuly to be translated . why you haue falsified S. Augustines
wordes putting in Dominico in the church , for, in Dominica
mensa, in our lordes table: I know not, onlesse it were, for that
you feared least an answer should be thought necessary by S. Au-
gustine to consecrate and offer that sacrifice vpon . The Sacra-
ment in some places is euery day prepared and consecrated by
priesstes in our lordes table, and from thence by the same priesstes
is daily receiued . In some places this is donne now and then
certaine dayes comming betwen. wil you of this conclude, that
where the people receiued not daily , the priesstes offered not by
the Daily Sacrifice? How holdeth your argument? Merely you
can neuer of S. Augustines wordes conclude that negative.
Let vs then see , whether you gather it better of your other pla-
ces.

Ad. Iew:
corrup-
teth S.
Augusti-
ne by put-
ting in one
worde for
an other.

Iewel.

Likevise also *saith S. Ambrose, Euery weeke yve must celebrate the
Oblation, although not euery day vnto strangers , yet vnto the inhabit-
antes at least twice in the weeke. S. Augustine saith, the Sacrament was
ministred at certaine daies, S. Ambrose saith, sometimes twice in the
weeke, and not euery day.

The. 134.
vnto truth.
S. Am-
brose saith
otherwise,
the place
is altoge-
ther falsi-
fied,

Harding.

You report S. Ambroses wordes otherwise then he spake
or meant. He spake not of ministring the oblation, as you falsifie
his saying, wherby you meane your owne ministracion of the
Communion: he spake plainly of the Oblation and Sacrifice of
the Church, which is the body and bloud of Christe, that is con-
secrated on the aulter, which S. Augustine, as is before reher-
sed, calleth the table of our lord. S. Ambrose wordes be these in
that place where he saith, Priesstes and Deacons must forbeare
the companie of a woman, because it is necessary they be present
in the church daily, Omni enim hebdomada offerendum est, etiam

Ad. Iew.
corrup-
teth S.
Ambrose.

Ambrosius
1. Tim. 6.3.

A Reioindre to

si non quotidie peregrinis, incolis tamen vel bis in hebdomada.
That is to say . For euery vveeke the oblation is to be made , or
 Sacrifice is to be offred, although not euery day for strangers, yet
 for the inhabitantes at least twise in the vveeke.

For stran
gers. **Marke** I you not that I English peregrinis, and incolis , for
 strangers, and for the inhabitantes, for so it ought to be Englished, not
 vnto strangers, and vnto the inhabitantes , as you haue corrupted the
 place . For the oblatio n which S. Ambrose speaketh of, is to be
 offred vp vnto God in the Masse, and not vnto strangers o; in-
 habitantes, neither is it at al lawfull to offer Sacrifice vnto men,
 as you knowe pardy. And that holy Father here speaketh of the
 Sacrifice, not of your newe sounde Ministration, for offerre, is
 offerre. to offer o; to Sacrifice, it is not to Minister, onlesse the worde of
 Ministering implie oblation, as a worde moze commo and gene-
 ral implieth the signification of the particular o; special , which
 to thinke in this place is beside iudgement and reason, albe it by
 you is signified to Minister the Sacrament.

I mani-
fest testi-
mony for
the Masse
 If you presse me with the two datine cases peregrinis and in-
 colis , & reppone my translation for strangers and for the inhabi-
 tantes: remember your Grammer rule M. Jewel: Verbes put ac-
 quisitively, that is to say, with the token for, require after them
 the Datine case: as habeo huic , non habeo illi: I haue for this
 man, I haue not for him. So by S. Ambrose, offerendum est per-
 egrinis, we must offer , or oblation must by made although not
 euery day for strangers , yet for the inhabitantes twise in the
 weeke. This place is clere for the Sacrifice which is offered vp
 in the Masse, and so maketh for the Masse, it maketh not against
 the Masse, nor against the Daily Sacrifice of the Church. For al-
 though in the Church where S. Ambrose lyled, the Sacrifice
 was offred but twise in the weeke, yet might it haue ben oftener,
 yea daily offred in other places. For S. Augustine writing to Ma-
 narius

nuarius, saith, alibi nullus dies intermittitur quo non offeratur. In some places no day is let passe in vvhich the Sacrifice is not offered.

Speaking of that blessed woman Monica his mother, he saith that befoze she died, she gaue no commaundement touching any sumptuous and honorable burial, but only desyred her Memorie to be made at the aulter, which aulter she serued (doubtlesse by offering the Sacrifice with Clothe which the Priest offered in ministerie) without intermission of any day, from whence she knewe the holy Sacrifice to be dispensed, whereby the hand-vvriting that vvas contary vnto vs, is quite blotted out. Of this place it is clere that S. Augustine's Mother had Masse every day. and that in the same was a propitiatorie Sacrifice of Christs do by really present offered vp. Neither is the Sacrifice of the Church called the daily Sacrifice for that it is offered by Priests every day precisely in every place: but for that it is very often offered, and for that there is no day excepted, in which it is not, or may not be offered.

Your epiphonema, by which you auouch both S. Augustine, and S. Ambrose to speake on your side, is no lesse false, the your translation of their wordes was corrupte, and the whole handling of them was besides their meaning. For where as you say thus, S. Augustine saith, the Sacrament vvas Ministered at certaine daies, S. Ambrose saith, sometimes twise in the weeke, and not euery day: All this runneth on false ground. For neither S. Augustine speaketh of the Sacrament as it was ministered, but as it was prepared vpon our Lodes table, and frequence receiued, which may wel be vnderstanded of the Priest: Neither speaketh S. Ambrose of it as it was ministered and bled for a Communion, but as it was offered in Sacrifice to almighty God. Seeing then these two places make nothing for you, of like your thirde shal be of better force, and recompense the weakenes of the other.

August.
ad Ianna.

epist. 113.

Aug. lib. 9.

Conf. c. 13.

S. Augustinus
Mother had
Masse euery
day. Colol. 2.

A Reioindre to

Merely the good face that you put on it in the entrie, promisseth
nolesse, where you say thus.

Iewel.

But vvhat recorde hereof can be plainer, then the Councel of Toledo?
Conci. To- The vvordes in English be these: There be sundrie Priestes in Spaine,
let. 4. ca. 9. that touching the prayer that the Lorde taught, and commaun-
ded Daily to be said, say the same onely vpon the Sonneday, and
vpon no day els. Hereof vve may very vvell geather, that if the Priestes
in Spaine said the Lordes prayer onely vpon the Sonneday, forsomuch as the
Communion is neuer ministred vvithout the Lordes prayer, therefore the
Priestes in Spaine ministred not the Communion, but onely vpon the Son-
neday.

Harding.

what is
that Jewell
hath take
in hands to
your.

This place serueth M^r. Jewels turne no better, then the two
former. Forgete not Reader, what he hath taken in hande to
proue. It is this, that in such places, where as the Sacrament
was not daily receiued of the people, it was not receiued pri-
uately and daily of the Priest, when he celebrated the daily sacri-
fice, as much to say as this: where the people receiued not, there
the Priestes did not say Masse. This negative proposition on-
lesse he proue to be true vniuersally, he proueth nothing. For
we may alwaies obiecte, that although it were not so in places
by him alleged: yet it might haue ben in other places. And if
it be proued of any one place, then is the priuate Masse proued.

This testimonie out of the fourth Councel of Toledo, were
it without corruption alleged, as it is not: yet it speaketh onely
but of the Priestes of Spaine. What if we graunted, that the
Priestes of Spaine ministred not the Communion, but onely
vpon the Sonneday: yet wil it not follow thereof, but that some
otherwhere priestes might say masse and offer daily.

Albeit the question is not of the ministring of the Commu-
nion,

nion, but of the sacrifice, which the Priestles oftentimes distrib, whē the people had not the Communion distributed vnto the. *¶* Jewel because he can not away with the Sacrifice, neither with the terme of sacrifice: turneth alwaies his tale, that should expresse the Priestles sacrifice or oblatiō, into the Ministratiō of the Communion, as though it were one thing, to offer vp the Sacrifice which is the body and bloud of our Lozde, and to minister the Communion, wherby he meaneth his *¶* Genenian Ministratiō. Now the Communion is ministred vnto the people after that the Sacrifice is offred, and as we may say, when Masse is donne. For when the Priest hath once receiued the holy oblation him selfe, al is donne that is required to this Sacrifice. And though the people receiue not, yet is al donne that is necessary to the condition of the Sacrifice.

And where as he saith, the Communion is neuer ministred without our Lordes Prayer, he deceiveth the vlearned with amphibologie of the worde. If he meane by his wordes of Ministratiō, the Consecration, and al that is necessary by Institution of Chyiste, and is obserued religiously of the Church: so we graunt, the Communion is neuer ministred, that is to say, the hoste or oblation is neuer prepared, as *¶* Augustine termeth it, and consecrated, without our lordes prayer, and yet therewith as with the essential wordes of the Sacrament, it is not consecrated, but with the special wordes of our Lozde with which he consecrated at his supper, as is befoze said. But if he meane by the Ministratiō, the deliuer y, geuing, reaching forth, or imparting of the Sacrament, which is the Priestles office, and also the Deacons in some cases: this is alwaies done without our Lordes prayer. By this it is euident, that this place proueth not his purpose, though it had ben truly alleged. But now may it please the Reader to consider, how truly and sincerely *¶*

¶ Jew. turneth the worde Sacrifice or oblatiō, into Ministratiō of the Communion.

In Iohan. trailla. 26.

A Reioindre to

M. Jew. Jewel hath handled this Colicel of Toledo. As thou findest him corrupteth in this, and sundry other places, so credite him. First sheweth he corrupteth and falsifieth the words of the Colicel. For whereas it speaketh but of certaine of the Priestes of Spaine, by his false translation, and glosing vpon it, of some or certaine, first he maketh sundry, then proceeding forth, he calleth them Priestes indefinitely, and at length concludeth with the Priestes of Spaine in general, as though the Colicel had meant of al. The wordes of the Colicel be these. Nonnulli Sacerdotū in Hispanijs reperiuntur, qui Dominicā orationem, quam Saluator noster docuit & præcepit, nō quotidie, sed tantū die Dominica dicant. In English thus. There be certaine of the Priestes in Spaine found out, that say not our Lords prayer daily, which our Saniour taught and gave in commandement to be said, but onely vpon the Sunday.

Concil. To-
letan. 4.
cap. 9.

Of this whereas M. Jewel cōcludeth, the Priestes in Spaine said our Lords praier only vpon the Sunday, & therefore the priestes in Spaine ministered not the Communion but only vpon the Sunday he the reader these words, & doth not cōferre them with the Colicel, what is he by them moued to beleue, but that it was the general case of Priests in Spaine neuer to say the Pater noster, but vpon the Sunday? This worde: Nonnulli, which signifieth certaine or some of the whole multitude, specially depēding of a genitiue case, as here, nonnulli Sacerdotū, is a worde restrained & limited to signifie som part of the multitud signified by the genitiue case, and if the worde of the genitiue case be put indefinitely, it signifieth the general multitude without limitation. So that there is a great

The mai-
ster of a
flocke of
sheep con-
ceiveth not
one sense
of these

difference implied betwen these two, nonnulli Sacerdotum, some of the Priestes, and, Sacerdotes, the Priestes. The like difference is in our English tong. So greates oddes there is, whether whe a mā speaketh of any multitude, he say some, or the. Both a Bētle that loneth his game wel, heare these two reportes with one as-
section

fection of minde, Sy, some of your deere be hunted out of your parkes, and, y^e deere of your parkes be hunted out of your ground: also tales: the sheepe be in your corne, and, some of your sheepe be in your corne. By the sheepe he under-standeth y^e stocke, by some, hee vnderstandeth a smaller number. Dides betweene some, & the.

No lesse difference is to be vnderstanded in y^e place of this Col-
 cel, which M. Jewel so wily corrupteth by reporting y^e of the prie-
 stes in Spaine, which was to be reported only of some or certain
 of y^e priestes in Spaine. I wil not deuise a fond argument, & say
 it is his, which is his wont towards mee, albeit I can not here
 deuise a sonder, then he maketh him selfe: but if he would frame
 his reasoⁿ as the place leaⁿeth him, and ministrerth mater, thus he
 might say: Certaine of y^e priestes in Spaine said not our Lordes
 prayer euery day, but vpon the Sonday only: The daily Sacrifice
 is neuer offered wout our Lordes prayer: Ergo, certaine of the
 priestes in Spaine offered not euery day, but only vpon y^e Son-
 day. This Argument may be graunted without prejudice of any
 thing that I said, and the conclusion may be admitted for true,
 so farre as the Minor is true.

Of this saying of the Councel it may wel be inferred, that
 ether priestes in Spaine did say our Lordes prayer euery day: o-
 therwise the exception of some had ben void by M. Jewels owne
 logike, as is befoze noted. And there is nothing here to y^e contra-
 ry, but y^e they might also haue offered euery day y^e daily Sacrifice.

I marvel that M. Jewel would bring this testimonie to
 proue his mater by, seeing that the priestes whose il doing he ta-
 keth for his defence, were condemned by that Councel for so do-
 ing, and by the storie of the time it may be gathered, they forbare
 to say the prayer of our Lorde daily, because being proude in
 their owne conceit, they thought them selues so pure of life, as
 they needed not to saye that necessary prayer euery day. For
 trauelle whereof, the fathers assembled there, decreed thus.
 Who so euer of the Priestes or inferiour Clerkes doo omitte
 to saye this our Lordes prayer euerye daye, eyther in Pub-
 like or Private Seruice: Let him bee deprived of the honour

Council. To-
 letan. 4.
 cap. 9. in
 fine.

A Reioindre to

of his order, as condemned for his pride.

By this condemned pride and euil demeanour of a few Priests in Spaine, M. Jewel would proue, that there was no Sacrifice celebrated in other times, when as the people receiued not the Sacrament, and that the Communion was ministred onely vpon the Sonnedayes. which if it be true, I meane if the Communion were not ministred in Spaine but vpon the Sonnedayes, then certaine it is, that there was Masse said, and the Sacrifice offered at certaine times when the Communion was not ministred. For the Fathers of that Toletane Councel finding fault with certaine Priests, that would not sing the song of the three children, wherein the Vniuersal creature of heauen and earth praiseth God, in Missa Dominicorum dierum, & in solennitatibus Martyrum, in their Masse of the Sonedaies, and in the solempne feastes of Martyrs: ordeined, that it should be song through al the Churches of Spaine and Galicia, in omnium Missarum solennitate, at the solemnitie of al Masses. Forasmuch as they refused to sing that song of the three children in their Sonneday Masses, and in those which they celebrated in high feastes of Martyrs, and thereupon a Decree was made, that it should be song in al Masses: it is cleare, that they vsed to sing or say that song at other Masses, neither would the Fathers haue made a Decree for it to be song in al Masses, had not there Masses ben said in other times beside Sonnedayes, and Martyrs feastes.

Again if the Communion were ministred in Spaine vpon the Sonneday onely, then was there no such Communion of a multitude ministred at the Masses in the Martyrs feastes and at other times. And so by that Councel Masse wil easily be proued to haue ben celebrated in Spaine without the Communion of a number, which M. Jewel calleth the priuate Masse. For it foloweth necessarily. The Communion was ministred onely

Ca. 13.

In argu-
ment for
Prose of
Priuate
Masse.

shely upon the Sonneday, Masse was said in other times and
feastes; Ergo, there was Masse without the ministration of
the Communion. Here must he either recant what he said be-
fore, or yelde to private Masse.

Finally, sith that M. Jewel alloweth so wel the auctoritie of
the fourth Council of Toledo, we requie him by auctoritie of
the same Council, to confesse and acknowledge the Masse, which
is so much mentioned and allowed of the same, for prouise wherof
I referre him to sundry places thereof, namely to the. 12. 13. and
16. Canon. If he and his felowes would be induced to admit
the Masse, wherof there is no doubt by that Council, there
should not so much a doo be made touching private Masse, as
they call it. For if the Masse be good and holy (as it is) of it
selfe, the peoples receiuing or forbearing from receiuing with
the Priest for a time, maketh it not better nor worse. Neither
can he now inslye etiect that Council, whose witness he voucheth.
For by the ciuil Lawe, if a man vse any witnesses in one cause, and
the same witnesses be brought forth against him in an other cause:
it shal not be lawfull for him to make exception against their per-
sons.

L. si quis.
C. d. test.

The. xxvij. Division.

In this Division I allege these wordes of S. Chrysostome, to
proue that the Sacrifice was Daily offered. Quid ergo nos?
Nonne. &c. Then what is that we doo? Doo we not Offer
euery day? Yeas verely. But we doo it for the recording of his
death. And it is one hoste, not many. Because this is a mani-

Chrysost.
in. 10. cap.
ad Heb.

A Reioindre to

test place for witness of the Daily Sacrifice, and in dede such as can not be avoided, specially the circumstance of the mater treated in the homilie of S. Chrysostome from whence those wordes be taken, duly weighed and considered: M. Jewel being enemie to the blessed Sacrifice, thought best so to order the talke of his Replie, as he might bring the whole proesse to an uncertainty and darkenesse, and the reader to a confusion. First he coueteth to discredite me, thinking thereby to diminish the autoritie of the Doctors saying.

Iewel.

Ch. 139. Here M. Harding (saith he) notably betrayeth himselfe, laying forth for a countenance a fewre of Chrysostomes wordes, *and the same nothing is the mater, *beuyng and mangling them, as him listeth best.

Harding.

Ch. 136. Here M. Jewel not able to answer S. Chrysostome, saith his pleasure of me that alleged him, what cause he had to say, that I doo notably betray my selfe, he sheweth not. That the words of the Doctour pertain to the mater, it can not be denied. yet because he is so impudent, as to deny it, it shal be proued. That I betwe them and mangle them, it is not so vncourteously, as slanderously spoken. That false practise I leane to him self, who bleth it more, then any of his false Brethren, of what secte so euer they be. And in this very place he bleth it.

Iewel.

These wordes of S. Chrysostome, as they make nothing for Priuate Masse, so do they very well declare, what the olde Fathers meant by these wordes, Oblation, and Sacrifice in the holy Ministration: Chrysostome compareth the Sacrifices of the Leues in the Lawe, with the Sacrifice of Christe in the Gospel. He saith, the Sacrifices of the Lawe were many, and vniuersall, and therefore daily renewed. This of the Gospel, is one, and perfect, and therefore euermore lasting.

Harding.

Harding.

These wordes of S. Chrysostome I alleged not for the private Masse, as it is private in your sense, but for the daily Sacrifice, yea, if you will so take it, for the Masse. For besides the Masse & without the Masse, the Sacrifice of the Church is not offered, and to prouise of that matter they pertaine. Neither do his wordes so much declare, what the Fathers meant by these wordes oblationis & Sacrificii, in y^e holy Ministrariis, which you say, as thei witnesse, that they offered daily for y^e redempcion of Chyries death.

Truth it is also, that he compareth the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, and the Sacrifice of the Gospel together, saying, they were sundrye and vnperfite, and therefore daily renewed: This, one, perfite, and euerclasting. He resembleth also the olde Sacrifices to salues, of litle strength, which he daily laid to the wounde, and heale it not. This Sacrifice he likeneth to a fountaine salue, that being once laid on the wounde, maketh it perfittely hole, so as it neede no moze to be renewed and laid on againe.

All this is true, I confesse. You needed not to haue bestowed so many wordes in a matter not doubtful. Wee varie not (you knowe) about the Sacrifice of the Crosse. That was once offered with shedding of Blood for redemption of the worlde, and is not so to be offered any moze. But what say you to the external and publike Sacrifice of the Church? we would gladly heare you tel vs a plaine tale thereof, whereby we might vnderstand your faith to agree with the faith of the Church therein. Corrupt not the meaning of S. Chrysostome in that Homilie which I allege, and yeelde vnto it: and wee shall in that great point agree well enough. Hereto you say thus,

The Sacrifice of the crosse. The external Sacrifice of the Church.

Ierul.

He saith further, that vnto of the Gospel haue a Sacrificus also,

GG 9

and

A Reioindre to

The. 137.
Untruth.
S. Chrys.
Some
render
no such
cause.

The. 138.
Untruth.
S. Chrys.
Some
saith not
so. this
place is
fowly cor-
rupted &
falsified.

and that daily, but in remembrance of that Sacrifice once made vpon the Crosse. And although vva Sacrifice in sundry places, yet saith he, the Sa-
crifice is but one, because it hath relation vnto that one Sacrifice of Christ.
And therefore he addeth, Quomodo vna est hostia, & non multae? &c.
How is it one Oblation, and not many? Because it was once offered, it
was offered into the holy place: *But this Sacrifice (meaning the mini-
stration of the Sacrament) is an example of that. And what he meaneth
by this vvorde exemplar, he sheweth a few lines before. Quae formam
tantum alicuius habent, exemplar ostendunt, non autem virtutem.
The thinges that beare onely a likenesse, shew the samplar of some other
thing, but not the power of the same: as an Image sheweth the paterne of
a man, but not the power of a man. Hereof S. Chrysostome concludeth thus:
The thing that we doo, is donne in remembrance of that thing that was
donne before. For Christe said, Do this in my remembrance. Hereby it ap-
peareth in what sense the olde Fathers vsed these vvordes Oblation, and
Sacrifice.

Harding.

Mr. Jew.
heweth &
mangleth
S. Chrys.
ostomes
wordes, &
racketh
the to his
Sacramen-
tary here-
lie.

Such hewing and mangling of S. Chrysostomes wordes,
betrayeth your mater Mr. Jewell, and causeth it worthily to be
suspected. If you had meant good faith, you would haue laid
them forth plainly and truly: now that you bring them in so by
peccemeale, taking what semeth to make for your purpose, and
leaning out the chiefe substance, which you impugn, alter the
order of them, and wrest the whole to a contrary sense of the Sa-
cramentaries: as you deceiue the ignorant, so among the lear-
ned you procure discredite to your whole doings, and by this
make them witnesses of your false dealing.

Mr. Jew.
els evil in
tent tou-
ching the
Sacrifice.

Your intent is to perswade the external and public Sacrifice
of the Church not to be the true Sacrifice in deede, but a
figure, signe, token, samplar, or picture of the true Sacrifice. A
Sacrifice we haue, you say, and that daily, but in remembrance
of the Sacrifice once made vpon the Crosse. Truth it is, the dai-
ly

ly Sacrifice of the Church is a Sacrifice commemorative, and that we do, is donne in remembrance of that which was donne upon the Crosse. Yet is it the true Sacrifice, because the thing that is Offred now, and that was Offred upon the Crosse, is one thing. It is one, say you, because it hath relation vnto that one Sacrifice of Christe. And you report it as out of S. Chrysostomes mouth, where as he neuer said it, and what you meane by your relation, I referre it to your selfe. Sure I am, that learned Father neuer spake so. He affirmeth it to be one Sacrifice, that is offred of many and in many places, as Christe is one, and not many Christes, one body, and not many bodies.

But this Sacrifice say you, is an example of that. It is exemplar, a samplar, or paterne of that, I graunt, and so saith S. Chrysostome. Knowe you not that a thing may be a samplar, and the truth of thing it selfe? Saith he not there, Veritas & exemplar communicant inuicem? It is a sampler in respect of the way or meane of Offring. The truth, in respect of the substance it selfe of the thing Offred. It is not Offred in the Church, as it was Offred upon the Crosse, and therefore this is a samplar of that. Yet that which is Offred in the Church daily, is the same body of Christ, that was once Offred upon the Crosse, and so it is the truth, so it is the true Sacrifice, so it is the same. Therefore after that S. Chrysostome, had called this Sacrifice a samplar of that, as though he had forsene the Obiection that the Sacramentaries at this day make against the veritie of this Sacrifice: he addeth immediately in the same sentence, id ipsum semper offerimus, we Offer vp alwayes the selfe same thing, which part of the sentence M. Iewel could craftily nippe away from the rest, least it should betray his whole matter.

And as here he nippeth and clipperth away wordes, so in the same sentence, he altereth the sense by putting in wordes of

M. Iewel.
nippeth &
clipperth
from S.
Chrysost.
& maketh
his untrue
doctrine.

A Reioindre to

his owne with a Parabolis. For whereas S. Chrysostome saith, hoc autem sacrificium exemplar est illius, id ipsum semper offerimus; This Sacrifice is a samplar of that, we Offer euermore one selfe thing: he by cutting of the ende of the sentence, and by putting into the rest a patch of his owne, maketh him to say thus. But this Sacrifice (meaning the ministracion of the Sacramēt) is an example of that. I fel not here what he intended, in that he corrupteth and altereth S. Chrysostomes wordes, whom whereas he said, quæ formam habent alicuius, tantum exemplar ostendunt, non autem virtutem: he maketh to speake thus, quæ formam tantum alicuius habent, exemplar ostendunt. &c. I shal wouldest iudge it a thing intollerable good Reader, if thou sawest, how he skipperth to and fro; how he wresteth and wryngeth, how he parteth and setteth together, how he hackleth and manglcth this Doctors sayings in this very Diuision. Yet is he not ashamed in this place it selfe to put in the Margent of his booke this Note of such vnttrue deaking against me, M. Harding nippeth Chrysostomes wordes: for that I alleged not certaine long sentences by him brought in, which pertained nothing to my purpose. wherein he seemeth to follow the counsell that a gyfle once gaue her mother, as she began to chide w an other woman. Mother, (quod she) cal her hooze first, for she will cal you so els by and by. So M. Jewel knowing in his owne conscience I shoud haue cause to reprove him of betwng, manghing, and nipping S. Chrysostomes wordes, thought best to p̄uent me, by imputing vnto me the same fault first.

Because M. Jewel bendeth his whole force against the Sacrifice of the Church, & would men to beleue that we haue not true Sacrifice in dede, but only a figure and samplar of it, & hath much abused the Reader to the auortice of S. Chrysostome: I may be sens what he thought here of, I thinke it good, truly to lay

lay forth his wordes touching this matter. After that he hath declared the weakeneſſe and imperfection of the Sacrificers of the olde lawe, which were continually renewed day by day, and like a bad ſaine were ſtil laid vnto the wound, and wrought no perſect health: he commeth to ſpeake of the external and publike Sacrifice of the Church, and ſaith. Quid ergo nos? Nonne per ſingulos dies offerimus? &c.

Then what is that which we doo? Doo we not offer day by day? Yeſ verely we doo ſo, but we doo it for remembrance of his death. And this hoſte or Sacrifice is one, not many. How one, and not many? Becauſe it was once offred, it was offered into the holy place. And this Sacrifice is a ſamplar of that, wee offer alwaies the ſelfe ſame thing. Neither doo we offer one Lambe to day, an other to morow, but alwaies we offer the ſelfe ſame. Therefore in this reſpect this Sacrifice is one. Els forasmuch as it is offred in many places, what ſhal we ſay, there be many Chriſtes? Not ſo, there is but one Chriſte in euery place, being here ſul and whole, and there ſul and whole, one body. For as he which is offred euery where, is one body, and not many bodies: ſo alſo it is one Sacrifice. And he is our high biſhop, that hath offred v^p the Oblation that purgeth vs: the ſame offer we alſo now, which hauing then ben offred, can not be ſpent. And that which we doo, is donne in remembrance of that which is already donne. For doo ye this, ſaith he, in my remembrance. It is not an other Sacrifice that we doo, as the high Prieſt did, but alwaies we do the ſelfe ſame: yea rather we worke a remembrance of the Sacrifice. Thus ſaith S. Chryſoſtome.

There is to be noted, firſt, that we, that is to ſay, the Church, or rather p^rieſtes of the new teſtament the publike miniſters of the Church in this behalf, doo offer v^p the Sacrifice euery day.

¶ Secondly

Secondly

Chryſoſt.
hom. 17. in
Epiſt. ad
Heb.

The de-
claratioⁿ of
S. Chry-
ſoſtomes
ſaying.

A Reioindre to

Secondly, that it is one Sacrifice, and not many, how often, and in how many places so euer it be offered. Thirdly, how is it one Sacrifice? because we offer alwaies one selfe same thing. Fourthly, what is that one selfe same thing? It is the body of Christe, it is the Lambe, it is the Sacrifice that cleanseth vs, which Iesus our high Bishop offered. Fifthly, this body though it be offered so many times, and in so many places: yet it can not be consumed, as the Sacrifices of the olde lawe were.

A samplar
and the
thing it
selfe.

Yet this notwithstanding, saith M. Iewel, it is a samplar, and it is done in remembrance. True it is, but it is not onely a samplar, that is to say, the truth is not shut out. And it may be done in remembrance of the death of Christe, though the thing now offered in Mysterie and in a Sacrament, be the same that was then offered openly to eyes and other senses of flesh in manifestation of flesh.

And as touching that it is a samplar, where S. Chrysostom so calleth it, there he calleth it also the thing it selfe, *Id ipsum semper offerimus*, we offer alwaies the selfe same thing, saith he, not one Lambe to day, and an other Lambe to morrow, we offer alwaies one Lambe. It is a samplar concerning the manner of offering, which is vnbloudy, or without blood shedding, but concerning the substance of the thing that is offered, it is the very thing it selfe, that was geuen and Sacrificed for the redemption of the world. The vnitie, or if it be lawful so to speake, the onenesse of the thing offered, maketh that of the Crosse, and this of the Church, to be one Sacrifice.

The end
of both
oblations
is diuerse.

And as the manner of offering is diuerse, so is the ende of both offerings also diuerse. That vpon the Crosse was done to purchase saluation to mankind. And the same by that Oblation was sufficiently, as touching Christs behalf, to atone-ment procured.

Now

Now we offer the same Lambe, the same Hoste, the same Sacrifice after an vnbloudy and impassible maner, not to thintent we may now first of al worke any new redemptiō therby: But by celebrating the Memorie of our Lordes Passion, wee may geue God thanks for our saluatiō already obtained vpon the Crosse, & that God vouchsafe through our faith and deuotion, and the presence of his Sonnes blessed Body vpon the Altar to applie the merite of the same Death and Passion vnto vs.

This notable place of S. Chrysostome geueth vs to vnderstand, what was the Fathers faith touching the daily Sacrifice in the Greeke Church. It shalbe to good purpose, to declare by witnesse of some of the Latine Fathers, that the same doctrine was likewise taught in the Latine Church. What may we learne of him, which among al is esteemed for a most excellent learned man: S. Augustine I meane. who writing vpon the xxxix. Psalme, after that he hath declared, that the Sacrifices of the old Lawe were figures of the Sacrifice to come, and as promising wordes that were then spoken, when the thing promised was not yet performed: and afterwarde when the thing promised was performed, were to be spoken no more, but to be taken away, because that which they promised was fulfilled: saith by way of question, the rather to commend it vnto memorie: Quid est quod datum est completium? what is that which is geuen for the accomplishment, that is to saye, for performance of the olde figures that continually spake as it were, and wrought not, promised a true Sacrifice, and performed not? To this question thus he answereth. Corpus quod nostis, quod non omnes nostis, quod vnam qui nostis omnes, non ad iudiciū poneritis. It is the Body which ye knowe, which al ye knowe not, which al ye that doo knowe, I pray God ye know it not to your damnation,

The faith
of the La-
tin church
touching
the Sac-
rifice.

Aug. in
Psal. 39.

A Reioindre to

Againe to make the matter more cleere, he saith further, *Exhibita est veritas promissa*. The truth which was promised is presently deliuered. We are in this body, of this body we are partakers, we know what we receiue, and ye that know not, know it, and whē ye shal haue learned it, I pray God ye take it not to your
2. Cor. 11. damnation. For he that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to him selfe. *Beate S. Augustine* most evidently calleth the Body which *Christen* men receiue in the Sacrament, the very truth exhibited, which fulfilleth and performeth that the olde Figures promised. This body by his teaching is the accomplishing Sacrifice. wherby it is evident, the body that we receiue, to be the same that suffered. In this body we are, because through Gods grace we are in the vnitie of the Church, and being so we worthily receiuing it, receiue it to our great benefite. As for you *M. Jewel* and your companions, ye be not in this body, because ye be not in the vnitie of the Church, neither beleue ye any real presence of this body in your congregations, and though ye haue any, yet ye haue it not but to your further condemnation. Thus is the faith of the auncient *Grecke* and *Latine* Church concerning the Sacrifice of the Church; sufficiently witnessed by these two most learned Fathers. In comparison of whom in the iudgement of al such as bee not carried away with enery winde of doctrine, the wanton Challenge of *M. Jewel* ought to haue litle credite.

After that I haue sufficiently proued by the testimonie of *S. Chrysostome*, that the Sacrifice was daily offered in the Church, notwithstanding the complaint hee maketh for that the People came not daily to receiue with the Priest: I saye, that although *M. Jewel* graunt the daily Sacrifice, yet he wil stand stil in his negatiue; that is to say, he wil denie, there was euer any such
Rel. 24. b. Sacri-

Sacrifice celebrated without a company receiuing together with the Priest. For proufe of this (I say there) these be such places as I am perswaded withal. The better Learned men that be of more reading then I am, haue other, I doubt not. To this M. Iewel replieth as foloweth.

Iewel.

By this colde conclusion he cutteth of credite from al that he hath hitherto said, as not making shew sufficient to winne his purpose, and so condemneth his note made in the Margent, which was, Proufes for Priuate Masse: and layeth al the burthen of his groundes, vpon these other gheasses that hereafter folow.

Harding.

Conclusion properly to speake, in that place I make none, tolde nor hore. Onely I do soberly repute, what you wil demye, and wherewith I for my parte am perswaded in a point not very necessarie. For whether I can shewe, that a Masse was said without companie present to receiue with the Priest that said it, or no: what skilleth it? It might haue so ben, though it were neuer writen. And what a vaine thing had it ben, any man to write, that such a day in such a place, such a Priest or such a Bishop, celebrated the Sacrifice, and no man receiued the Sacrament with him? And if no man euer wrote it, how should I proue it? Such particularities and specialties of a facte in matters of smal weight, were very seldome recorded by the writers of the sixt six hundred yeares. What reason is it, wee should be driuen to proue it of the time so long ago, sith that it can not be proued of the time of our owne age? For how am I able to proue, that no companie of Communicantes receiued with the Priestes in Spaine this last yere, when they said Masse? And yet there is no doubt, but many Masses were there said, wherewith none receiued with the Priestes.

the proufe
of a circum-
stance of a
sacral act
can not
reasonably
be re-
quired.

DD ii

That

A Reioindre to

That Priestes within the first six hundred yeares did consecrate the body and bloud of Christ, vnder y^e formes of bread & wine, that they offered, and receined the same, wherein consisteth the Masse, which things done we vnderstand, when we speake of the external and publick Sacrifice of the Church: this haue I now proued, and hereafter it shal be more largely proued. But forasmuch as the Sacrifice is not impaired nor loseth his vertue by the lacke of companie receiuing it with the Priest, to what purpose is it to proue, that some times within the first six hundred yeares some Priestes at some times had no companie to receiue with them?

If companie of receiuers together with the Priest be not of the necessitie of the Sacrifice, why maketh M. Iewel so much ado about it, which being procured and obserued, yet would not he allow the custome of the Church? That company of receiuers together is of necessitie, we deny it. If he wil needes haue the world so to beleue, it is his parte to proue it: which as he hath gone about to do, and perfozmed it not: so when so euer he shal attempt it hereafter, he shal efsoues shew his vnablenesse.

How the
prouers of
sole recei-
uing serue
for prouers
of priuate
Masse.

As touching the note of my booke margēt, which is, Prouers for priuate Masse, though in that place I proue specially the sole receiuing: the aucthorities of the same sole receiuing, serue very wel for prouers of priuate Masse, which after your meaning is nothing els, but the Priestes sole receiuing. For if the sole receiuing be proued lawfull in other faithfull persons, as by sundry examples I haue proued: then what reason can be alleged, why it should not be good and lawfull also in a Priest? So in this respect, and for this cause, my note may be upholden, as good and reasonable, and to the purpose. For by what right sole receiuing is good, by the same is priuate Masse, as you terme it, also proued good.

Neither

Neither reflecteth the weight of our groundes touching the vnbloudy Sacrifice in the examples onely that here in my booke do folowe, which examples it liketh you to cal gheasses. By private Masse which terme we admit not, as neither do we admit that the Masse in respect of the Sacrifice is private: we may vnderstand two thinges by you to be meant, the Sacrifice of the Masse, and sole receiuing of the Priest. The groundes we haue for the one, and for the other being sufficient, and so both being proued, we care the lesse, how you take your pleasure at the newe terme private Masse, deuised in that sense which you attribute vnto it, by Martin Luther the founder of your pleasant Gospel.

By private Masse two thinges be vnderstanded, the Sacrifice, and the Priestes sole receiuing of the Communion.

The .xxix. Division.

Of the Decree which the auncient Martyr and Pope S. Soter made, that onlesse two were present, a Priest should not celebrate Masse, to chintent they might aply make answer vnto his salutation vttered in the plural number: I take occasion so to reason, as it might at that time seme lausful a Priest to say Masse, without companie receiuing the Sacrament with him. My wordes there be these. whereas the receiuing of Christes body is a farre greater thing, then to answer the Priest at Masse, if that holy Bishop and Martyr had thought it so necessary, as that the Masse might not be donne without it: doubtlesse of very reason and conuenience, he would, and should haue specially spoken of that, rather then of the other. But for that he thought other wise, he required onely of necessity, the presence of two for answer conueniently to be made.

De consec. dist. 1. can. hoc quotum.

Fol. 25. a.

DD. ii. This

A Reioindre to

This M^r. Jewel in his Replie answereth very slenderly, as every man may see, and here it shal appeare. But before he cometh to make his answer, he uttereth many wordes to an other purpose. First, he goeth to discredit al the Popes Decretal Epistles. Then he crauileth to disproue this Decree of S. Hieron. After this he wandereth abroad in other talke both vaine & vntrue, not worthy to be answered. Touching the Disproue of the Epistles Decretal, thus he saith.

Ieruel.

The. 139.
vntrath.
Gratian
doth not
shew so
much, as
it shal ap-
peare.

Gratian sheweth that the Decretal Epistles haue ben doubted of among the learned. And Doctor Smith although his auctoritie be not great, declared openly at Paules Crosse, that they can not possibly be theirs vy whose names they beare.

Harding.

If a man were in doubte before of the Decretal Epistles, by reading the argumentes which you bring to disproue them, he might instly doubt of them lesse. Had you no better reasons then these, you should not haue aduentured to disproue them. That you say of Gratian, is false. He sheweth no such thing, as you re-
pote. The contrarie rather he sheweth. Onely he saith, it is de-
maunded whether they haue force of auctoritie, soasmuch as they
be not founde in the body of the canons. His worde is queritur,
not dubitatur. And thereof he taketh occasion to allege good and
substantiall witness for their auctoritie. If we should say that le-
arned men doubted of al thinges, whereof they moue question
in their bookes: then should we beare the world in hande, they
doubted of God himselfe, of 7 Articles of our Crede, & of 7 pointes
of our faith that be must certaine, and most out of doubte. Of al
which they moue questions by this worde queritur, not because
they the selues doubt, but because by trial of argumentes & lear-
ning, they would remoue al others from occasion of doubte.

Gratian
is quite
contrary
to that M^r.
Jewel re-
porteth of
him.
The le-
arned schoo-
lemen are
not to be
thought to
doubt of al
those thin-
ges, whe-
reof they
moue que-
stion by
this word
queritur.

That

That the Bishops of Rome wrote decretal Epistles, and that they ought to be in Auctoritie, it is witnessed by the two great learned Fathers S. Leo. and Gelasius. We do so commaund by our declaration (saith S. Leo) al the Decretal constitutions as wel of Innocentius (of good memorie) as of al our predecessors, which haue ben openly set forth for orders and rules of the Church: that if any presumptuously committe offenses against them, he shal not obtaine forgeuenes hereafter.

Of the auctoritie of the Decrees and Decretal Epistles. Dist. xix. ca. Si Romanorum.

Of those Epistles Decretal thus writeth Gelasius. Decretales epistolas, quas beatissimi Papae diuersis temporibus ab vrbe Romanapro diuersorum Patrum consolatione dederunt, uenerabiliter recipiendas. We ordeine, that the Decretal Epistles, which the most blessed Popes at diuerse times for the comfort of diuerse Fathers haue genen forth from the Cite of Rome, to be reuerently received.

Decretum Gelasij in Conci. 70. episcoporum

The graue auctoritie of these two learned and auncient Fathers commending vnto vs those Epistles, ought to be of more weight, then that the light gheastes and surmises of M. Iewel should ouerweigh them, and bring them to discredit. As for my selfe, I define nothing. Yet I fynde no cause, for ought that he saith in disproue of them, why I should contemne them.

As for D. Smith, whether he said so at Pauls Crosse as you reposte, or no, I knowe not. The mater can not be decided by autoritie of his worde, specially spoken at that time, which you note in the second yere of king Edward. As in that place about that time he spake the truth, when he spake according to his conscience: so at an other time done after he vttered certaine vnttruthes for feare of persecution against his conscience, wherof as I can not excuse him, so if you accuse him, remember, that your selfe did the like in Queene Mariestime, when in a sollemn assemble at Wyntze you were

Doctour Smith.

A Reioindre to

as ready as any other man there, to subscribe to the Masse, and other pointes of the Catholike faith, against which now you profess such spite and hatred. But let vs heare the reasons, which you promise to utter for proufe, that the decretal Epistles be not theirs whose names they beare.

Answer
to D. Jewels
reasons
against the
Decrees
and Decretal
Epistles.
The. 140
In truth.
A burthen
of lyces la-
yd toge-
ther.

Ieruel.

* These decretal Epistles manifestly depraue, and abuse the Scriptures: they mainteine nothing so much as the state and kingdome of the Pope. They publish a multitude of vaine and superstitious ceremonies, and other like fantasies, they proclaime such thinges as M. Harding knoweth to be open and known lies.

Harding.

Walling is no proufe. This pelfe may serue for your pulpit, when you lacke better stuffe. Thus to disproue the Decretal Epistles, it is too ministerlike.

Ieruel.

The. 141.
In truth.
Anacle-
tus com-
maunded
no such
thing con-
cerning
S. Peters
Church.

* Anacletus, that was next after Peter, willoeth and straitly commaundeth, that al Bishops once in the yere, doo visite the entrie of S. Peters Church in Rome, vvhich they call limina Petri. Yet was there then no church built there in the name of Peter. For Pope Cornelius saith (as he is alleged) that he first tooke vp S. Peters bodie, and buried the same in Apoloes Church in Rome, at the least one hundred and forty yeres after that Anacletus was dead.

Harding.

That Anacletus was next after S. Peter, it is not throughtly agreed vpon among the best learned wryters. And what maketh this against the Decretal Epistles, which is writte in none of them? A Decree in dede is extant vnder the name of Anacletus, not that al Bishops should once in the yere visite the entrie of S. Peters Church in Rome, but that al Bishops which were immedyately subject vnto that See Apostolike, and were nigh vnto

Distin. 97.
iuxta
Sanctorū.

unto the Little, should either verely present them selues there in person, or appeare by their p^{ro}xie. Of any Church there is no mention made at al. If you thinke, we must graunt a church, because the Decree speaketh of limina Petri & Pauli, you are much deceived. Limina be the thresholde and haunce of a dore, through which one goeth into a house, and therfore the worde signifieth an entrie into a house.

By limina Petri & Pauli, which be the wordes of the Decree, is nothing els signified, but the place where the blessed bodies of those two holy Apostles were laid. And because at the first comming to the faith there was nothing in Rome, neither els where al the worde ouer in the opinion of the deuoute faithful people so reuerent, so honourable, and of so much estimation, as the bodies of those most blessed Apostles: thereof the place where they rested became to be famous among the Christians. And because it was vnder the grounde within a long vault or denne, and had but one entrie into it, not diuerse gates and doores, as Temples, and Palaices haue, as it was most convenient in that time of cruel persecutions, being but an entrance as it were into a house, and no house in dede: they called it by the name of limina Apostolorum, which name continewing to this day, though it signifie now the famous Church, where their bodies be kept, yet is it not necessary to say that then also it signified a Church. wherefore this obiecti^on of M. Jewel against the Decretal Epistles is of smal accompte.

That S. Cornelius the Pope tooke vp the bodies of S. Peter and S. Paul, out of Catacumbes (so is the place called where first they were layd) at the desire of the holy Marrone Lucina secretly by night for feare of the infidels: this is recorded both by S. Cornelius himself in his Epistle decretal, & also by Damasus. S. Pauls body was laid by Lucina in via Ostiensis, nigh to the

what is signified by limina Petri & Pauli.

The place where S. Peters & S. Pauls bodies first lay, was called Catacumbes. Damasus in Pontificali.

A Reioindre to

Id. Jew.
prophane
ly calleth
an Idols
temple by
the name
of a Church.

place where he was beheaded, and S. Cornelius laid S. Peters body in Vaticano among the bodies of holy Bishops, near vnto the place, where he was crucified, saith Damascus. As for the temple of Apollo, you might rather haue called it Apolloses temple, then Apolloses Church. But it semeth you esteeme the one as much as the other, els what meant you to cal an Idols prophane temple, by the name of a Church? Idols had neuer no Churches, neither euer spake any before so prophantly, that was of the Church.

Ieruel.

Pope Antherus maketh mention of Eusebius Alexandrinus, and Felix, which lyued a long time after him, and therefore was it not possible for him to know them.

Harding.

In epistola
Antheri.

Pope Antherus being consulted of certaine Bishops of Spaine, whether a Bishop might change his Bishopricke and take an other: answereth them, that in case of common vtilitie & necessitie it may be, not for the pleasure or ambition of any man. And for example he allegeth S. Peter, who was translated from Antiochia to Rome. Likewise Eusebius, who was taken from a litle towne, and made Bishop of Alexandria: And Felix, who for his learning and vertue was translated from the place where he was first elect, to Ephesus. That these two lyued a long time after Antherus, you say it, but you proue it not. Tierely I can not synde it. You speake it of your owne head boldly, as you do many other thinges. were it so that you had any good witness of it, it should haue ben put in among other your ambitious paintings of your margent, whereby you thinke to winne opinion of great learning among the vnlearned.

Ieruel.

Iewel.

Fabianus writeth of the coming of Nouatus into Italie. And it is cleare by S. Cyprian, and by Eusebius, that Nouatus came first into Italy in the time of Cornelius, which was next after him.

Harding.

It is not cleare neither by S. Cyprian, nor by Eusebius in the places by you alleged, that Nouatus came first into Italy in the time of Cornelius. Marius Scotus who liued about seven hundred yeres past, and is wel esteemed of the learned for his diligence in computation of times, mentioneth and alloweth the first Epistle Decretal of S. Fabianus, in which he speaketh of Nouatus coming into Italie. which argueth that it was taken for the Epistle of Fabianus before his time.

Platina in the life of this blessed Martyr concerning this matter writeth thus, Huius tempore exorta est Nouatiana heresis. In the time of Fabianus rose the heresie of the Nouatians.

That Nouatus came to Rome before the time of Cornelius, who succeeded Fabianus, thus it may be proued. Nouatus persecuted Nouatianus a Priest of Rome, as it is reported by Platina and others. Nouatianus being as some write, separated from the Church, as some reporte, ordered or made Bishop out of the Church by Nouatus that came to Rome from Aphyca, for that he was very desirous of a Bishopricke, made a great stirre against Cornelius, and did what he could, that he might not be made Pope. Now Nouatianus could not worke troubles against Cornelius, that he might not be chosen Pope, onlesse he had ben at Rome before he was elected: Again he was not knowen for such an euil man, but after that he had ben separate from the Church, and seduced by the conference he had with Nouatus: wherefore it seemeth plaine Nouatus was at Rome in the time of Fabianus. For after the Martyrdom of Fabianus the See was

The 142.
vnterth.
It is not
cleare.

Cyprian.
lib. 1 epi. 3.
Euse. lib. 6.
cap. 43.
Marius
Scotus.

That Nouatus came to Rome in the time of Fabianus Platina in vita Fabiani, & Cornelij.
Hieron. li. de scriptorib. Ecclesiasticis.

A. Reioindre to

Damasus in Pontificalli. vacant but six dayes, as Damasus writeth. So there is no in-
conuenience, but that Fabianus might write of Rouatus com-
ming into Italie, and geue the Bishops to whom he wrote, war-
ning to beware of the infection of that heresie. And thus you
haue said nothing hitherto that proueth the Decretal Epistles
not to be theirs, whose names they beare.

Iewel.

The. 143. vntruth. Damasus maketh expresse mention of such Decrees. Let his booke be trial. Neither S. Hierome, nor Gennadius, nor * Damasus euer made any
mention, either of such epistles, or of any such Decrees: which they would
not haue dissembled; if there had ben any such extant or knowen in their
time. Thus haue I briefly geuen a taste of these Decretal authorities,
that the reader may the better vnderstande, of what credite they ought
to be.

Harding.

You know the weakenes of this argument, I doubt not
M. Jewel. Your selfe say of it, that in scholes it is called argu-
mentum ab auctoritate negatiue, and that it concludeth not ne-
cessarily. And say if we should condemne what so euer is not men-
tioned of S. Hierome, Gennadius, and Damasus, to haue ben
written by the auncient fathers before their time, how many
things should we reiect, that be acknowledged to be authentical
by witnesse of other good writers? were there not certaine
Epistles of Julius the first spoken of by Athanasius, Sozome-
nus, and others, and be yet extant partly in Greeke, partly in La-
tine, of which neither S. Hierome, nor Gennadius, nor Dama-
sus euer made any mention? Many other things of good aucto-
ritie might here easily be rehearsed, of which S. Hierome, and the
two other neuer spake worde.

*Athana-
sius in A-
pologia. 2.
tripart. bi
stor. lib. 4.
The cause
why S.
Hierome
and Gen-
nadius
made no
mention*

That S. Hierome and Gennadius made no mention here
of, it is no maruel. For their profession is in the booke
whiche you meane, to write de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis,
among

among whom they thought not good to receybe them, that wrote nothing but Epistles, and brieft Decrees. Had these Decretal Epistles beene iust volumes, or such as might haue deserved the name of woozkes and bookes, they had ben mentioned.

But I marvel what you meant in saying that Damasus made no mention of any such Decretal epistles or Decrees. Either you haue read Damasus, or you haue not. If you euer read him, what impudencie was it to denie that is so manifest, and that you could not be ignorant of? If you neuer read him, who may trust you, that so boldly pronounce of a thing you knew not? If you folowed your notebooke, or y^e aduertisemēt which some of your brethren gaue you toward the filling of your booke: Let your Reader vnderstand, that so you may deceiue him in many other pointes, as you haue deceiued him in this.

For truch it is, Damasus writing brieftly the liues of the Popes that were befoze his time, mentioneth almost throughout his whole booke their Decrees, which in their Decretal Epistles they propounde to be kept and obserued.

Concerning S. Clement, he speaketh of two Epistles that he wrote, named Canonical, and expressely of the Epistle which he wrote to S. James. In the life of the blessed Marry Hope Alexander, he maketh mention of his Decree touching the vse of Holy water, which is expresse in his Epistle Decretal. So he mentioneth the Decrees of Sixtus, of Telesphorus, of Pius, of Anicetus, of Soter, of Eleutherius, of Victor, of Zephyrinus, of Calixtus, and likewise of other Popes, which Decrees he toucheth in manner with the very same woozdes, with which they be uttered in ech Popes Decretal Epistle.

For the Decretal Epistle of Innocentius the first, which

III 16

he

Aug. Iew.
by this is
proued ei-
ther im-
pudent in
lying, or
rash in as-
firming
that he
knew not,
and might
some haue
known.

Damasus
mencio-
neth sum-
dry popes
decrees &
decretals.
Damasus
in Pontif.
In vita
Clement.
S. Cle-
mentis E-
pistle to
S. James.
Holy
water.

August.
epist. 106.

A Reioindr: to

witnesse hee wrote to the Councel assembled at Carthage, teaching
for certain the popes Decretal epistles. In prima
epist. Celestini ad
Episcopos Gallie.
Ibidem in
sine operu
Prosperi.

hee wrote to the Councel assembled at Carthage, teaching
free wil and grace, beside S. Augustine, wee haue the ex-
presse witnesse of the learned Pope Celestinus. Likewise
wee haue his testimonie for the Decretal Epistle of Pope Zo-
simus concerning Grace, written to the Bishops of al the
worlde.

The Fathers of the Councel of Triburia confirmed
many of their Decrees by authortie of sundrie popes De-
cretal Epistles. which they would not haue donne, had
they ben of S. Jewels opinion. By expresse name they men-
tion the Epistles of these Bishops of Rome, of S. Clement;
Anacletus, Euaristus, Alexander, Zepherinus, Calistus,
Urbanus, Syricius, Innocentius, Leo, Gelasius, Grego-
rius. Againe Burchardus who liued aboue five hundred yeres
past, mentioneth the first epistle of S. Alexander the first, hauing
witness & authortie of so many, so auncient & so learned Fa-
thers for the Decrees and decretal Epistles, beside the credite
of Isidorus, who gathered them together into one volume: S.
Jewel of reason must beare with vs, if for verditte of this mater,
we bid him stand backe, and geue place to his betters. More
I could say for the Decrees and Decretal Epistles, but this
may suffice for this time.

The. 144.
vntuth.
the decrees
speake
not of co-
manie pre-
sent, but of
twoo to
make an-
swere.
The. 145
vntuth.
Neither
speake
f. Augu-
stin of the
people of
Rome, nor
both they
of the peo-
ples recei-
uig every
day toge-
ther.

Iewel.

Now touching the mater, that by this Decree of Soter, it
should then be lausful for the Priest there to say Masse, hauing onely
two others in his * companie, the state and storie of the time considered,
it seemeth very unlikely. For both S. Augustine, and S. Hierome, haue
recorded that the people of Rome, euen in their time vsed to receiue the
Communion * together every daie. Which practise can hardly stand
with that is here imagined.

Iewel.

Harding.

What if the people of Rome were of so good deuotion, as to receiue the Communion together euery day, in case you said truth? Might it not be lawful for al that a Priest to say Masse hauing two others present to answere him? whether hee haue moe or no, of that the Decree speaketh not, as neither of Rome specially; but generally of what so euer place. And therefore you falsifie it, as you reposit it. The Decree requireth two to be present, for the conuenience of the answere, that is to be made to the Priestes salutation. It presupposeth not that others be absent.

Soters
Decree
falsly re-
posed by
H. Iew.

S. Augustine and S. Hierome in the places by your quotation noted, maketh nothing against Soters Decree.

S. Augustine saith, that in some places the Sacrament was receiued euery day, in some other places, vpon certaine daies. Neither speaketh he of Rome at al. Likewise in his Epistle to Iannarius, he saith, Some do receiue the Body and Bloude of Christe daily, some vpon certaine dayes.

August.
In Ioan.
tract. 26:
Ad Ianu-
arium. E-
pist. 112.
In Apolo-
gia ad-
uersus Io-
uianum.

Neither meaneth he of Rome, as you say. S. Hierome in dede telleth, that it was a custome at Rome to receiue the Body of Christe euery daie. But there he declareth that many receiued secretly in their owne houses, and woulde not receiue in Churches. In these three places is mention onely of daily receiuing, but that the people of Rome receiued the Communion euery day together, that is to say in one place, that is not auouched. And therefore the Decree of S. Soter may wel stand with the state and storie of the time, notwithstanding any thing that out of S. Augustine, or S. Hierome is here alleged.

Iewel.

The woordes also them selfe implie a manifest contrarietie.

II iij

For

A Reioindre to

The. 146 For this worde. Solennia, which here is vsed, semeth to importe * a so-
vntruth. lenne companie or resorte of the people. And yet this Soter requiring to
 the worde this action * onely the companie of three persons, neuerthelesse calleth it
 Solénia, Missarum solennia.
 doth not so import.

Harding.

The. 147. **vntruth.** This worde Solennia, hath not his name in considerati-
 Soter re- on of a companie or resorte of people, but in respect of a common
 quireth custome, be it yearely, daily, or at certaine prescript times.
 not onely It is deriued of Solus, and Annus. Cicero vseth solenne, for
 the com- wont or custome: as Ad Atticum. lib. 7. Nostrum illud solen-
 panie of ne seruemus, vt ne quem istuc euntem sine literis dimittamus.
 three to Let vs kepe our olde wonte, that we let no man that goeth thi-
 this actiō, ther, to go without our Letters. The worde Solennia sig-
 but that nifieth in Ecclesiastical writers, either holy feastes, or any what-
 two at the least beo present to answer p Priest. soeuer celebritytie and religious obseruance to be donne at holy
 Solénia, actes after a prescript manner and custome. And it is com-
 what is monly put with woordes signifying Sacramentes, or other
 signified by the things wherat faithful people shewe them selues reuerent. As
 word, and Missarum Solennia, Baptismi solennia, Ordinationis solennia,
 wherof nuptiarum, funeris, exequiarum solennia. wherefore that the
 it is so called. worde should importe a solemne companie, or resorte of the peo-
 ple, it is but your gheasse of a thing that to you onely seemeth,
 and is not.

Soters
Decree
misrepor-
ted by ad.
Isewel.

And wheras you say of Soter, as though he required to
 this holy action only the companie of three persons: therein you
 solow your common custome of falsifying, and misreporting.
 He is so farre from requiring the onely companie of three per-
 sons thereto, that by the Decree there is no let, why there may
 not bee presente at euery Masse, not onely the companie of
 three persones, but also of three score, three hundred, three
 thousand,

Isyvel

Ieruel.

*It may wel be doubted, whether Dominus vobiscum, or Orate pro me fratres, were any parte of the Liturgie of Rome in Soters time. For Damasus which was Bishop of Rome two hundred and fiftie yeres after that, writeth vnto S. Hierome, that thinges were donne with such simplicitie in the church of Rome in his time, that vpon the Sonneday there was nothing els but some Epistle of the Apostle, or some chapter of the Gospel read openly vnto the people: which whether he meant of the holy ministration or no, I leaue further to be considered.

Harding.

The simplicitie whereof Damasus complained in his Epistle to S. Hierome, was concerning the manner and order of singing, which in the Church of Rome at his time was very simple in comparison of the Grekes. Therfore he wrote to S. Hierome then lying in the East, to sende him the manner of singing of the Grekes, that in the Church of Rome they might haue Psalmes and Hymnes so by day and night, as they were song in the East churches. Though Damasus there make mention but of an Epistle, and of a chapter of the Gospel, (for he speaketh of both together, and not of either disiuunctiue, as you vntruly reporte his wordes) saying, they only vpon the Sonneday were reherfed, that is, as he seemeth there to meane, were longe, or pronounced with open voice song like: yet by those wordes he must not be thought to haue excluded the Masse, which you had rather call the Liturgie of Rome, and the holy Ministration, which worde for a while may serue you as wel to signifie your owne new deuised Communion, as the Masse of the Catholike church. For it must needs be graunted, that they of Rome receiued the Communion very often, and therfore had they the Masse necessary for the Consecration.

Neither haue we cause to thinke, that the Masse was not at Rome in Damasus time, seeing by his reporte we vnderstand,

It is it

The. 148.
In truth.
This can
not wel &
reasonably
be doubted
of by him
that readeth
Damasus
booke of the
Idopes
lyues and
decrees.

Damasus
vntruly
reported by
H. Iew.

Ministra-
tio, a word
guilfully
used by
H. Iew.
to diuerse
intentions
like a ship
mans host
that may
serue any
legge.

A Reioindre to

Prooues
that masse
was in
Rome in,
and befoze
Damascus
time.

Damasus
in Pontifi-
cali.

The Pas-
sion added
to the
Masse by
S. Alex-
ander.

Sanctus,
Sanctus,
Sanctus
by S.
Sixtus.
Gloria in
excelsis
by S. Te-
lesphorus.

it was there vsed long befoze his time. For in the life of the blessed Martyr Pope Alexander, who was fifth after S. Peter, he writeth of the Masse by name, as of a thing befoze vsed. Hic (saith he) passionem Domini miscuit in precatione sacerdotum, quando Missæ celebrantur. Alexander mingled our Lorde's passion with the prayer of the priestes, when Masses are celebrated. Yet is M. Jewel afraid of the name of Masse, and therfoze in steede of it, nameth the Liturgie of Rome.

Of the holy Martyr Pope Sixtus, he saith, that he ordeined, that when the priest commeth to the action of the Masse (meaning that parte of the Masse wherunto the perfide Chistians resorted, that which goeth befoze it, being that parte of the Masse wherunto the learners of the Faith called Cathecumens were admitted) the people should sing the song, Holy, Holy, Holy, our Lorde God of hostes.

Of Telesphorus he saith, that he instituted the Angels song, Gloria in excelsis, to be said befoze the Sacrifice. Likewise in the life of Zephyrinus, and otherwhere he maketh expresse mention of the Masse, and how it was to be celebrated. So that whereas Damascus describeth sundry thinges touching the Masse ordeined by the first Popes, and vsed befoze his time: there is no doubt but he maintained it and kept it in his owne time. wherfoze that which is here alleged out of his Epistle to S. Hierome, maketh no argument against the auncient order of the Masse, by which the priest saith, Dominus vobiscum, and orate p me fratres.

Iewel.

The 149.
Untruth.
S. Soter
requireth
it not, it is
bitterly
false.

Further this same Soter requireth, that both these two, *and as many others as be present, make answer vnto the priest: wherein is included both nearnesse of place for the people to stand in, and to heare, and also a common known tongue: which both are contrary to M. Hardinges Masse.

Harding.

Harding.

Will you neuer report the truth M. Jewel? will you alwaies be founde a falsifier? will you stil thus betray the weaknesse of your cause by making the world witness, that you haue nothing to helpe you, but shamelesse lying? why say you, Soter requieth, that bothe these two, and as many others as be present, make answer vnto the priest? why haue you conuerted in of your owne false stufte those wordes, and as many others as be present? what shameful shifte is this? Can not you helpe your matter but with such foisting in of wordes of your owne, to make some appearance of an vnt ruth?

Soters
Decree fal
sified by
M. Jew.

Now then when you proue your owne forgerie to be good and plaine truth, your wordes to be S. Soters wordes, then maye you saye what you liste of the nearnesse of place for the people to stand in, and of the common knowne tongue. But by such false additions of your owne, you proue nothing against the Masse of the Catholike Church, which it liketh your pleasant head to cal M. Hardinges Masse.

Touching that you bring here out of the Canonistes, Gerson, Innocentius, and Durandus, whom you allegc oftentimes rather to gainsay me, then for any regard you haue them in: I accompt it not worthy to be answered. As for my reason made out of this Decree, you report it otherwile then I make it. But your manifest vnt ruth and belying of my wordes I can not desemble. where you say thus.

Iewel.

But what if these two wil not come, neither to communicate, nor to be present at al? * Verely by M. Hardinges mynde the Priestes deuotion ought not to stay for want of copanie. For these be his very wordes a litle before: VVell none cometh: This is not a sufficient cause, why the faithfull and

The 150.
vnt ruth.
There can
no such
meaning
be gathe-
red out of
my wordes

KK ij.

godly

A Reioindre to

godly priest enflamed with the loue of God, seeing him selfe hungry and thirsty after that heauenly foode and drinke, should be kept from it. &c. This is a cause sufficient saith Soter : it is no sufficient cause saith M. Harding. The iudgement hereof I referre vnto the Reader.

Harding.

M. Jew:
falsifieth
my answer,
and corrup-
teth the
sense of my
wordes.

As euen now you falsified S. Soters decree by adding vnto it of your owne, so here you falsifie my saying, specially the meaning of it, by taking away that, whereby the truth appeareth. My mynde is not, that the Priest should say Masse, when he hath no person at all present, not so much as one to answer him: but that, if none be disposed to receiue the Sacrament with him, in this case he might receiue that heauenly foode him selfe alone. The lacke of others to receiue with him, is not a sufficient cause to kepe him from it, say I. Looke reader what I say in that place, and thou shalt easily perceiue, that I speake not of the absence of all others, but of want of receiuers. which M. Jewel knewe wel ynough. And yet of very purpose he reporteth it falsly. whereas I say in dede, Wel, none commeth: I meane, to receiue with the Priest. For so be my wordes in the sentence before. That oftentimes the priest at Masse hath no companions to receiue the Sacrament with him. &c. which wordes presuppose an assistance of one or moe to answer the Priest. whereas fore there is no contradiction between my wordes and this Decree, as M. Jewel hath vntuly said.

In my answer to the
challenge.
Fol. 12.

Jewel.

But (saith M. Harding) Soter requireth onely the presence of two, and these two were not commaunded to communicate: Ergo, the priest did receiue alone: and so there was undoubtedly priuate Masse.

M. Jew.
corrupteth, and
falsifieth
all that he
taketh in
hande.

Harding.

I frame not my argument, as you report it. I must alwaies syng one song vnto you, and tel you stil, that you falsifie all that you meddle with. Sith that you force me to repeat it againe,

gaine, thus I say in the place by you falsified. Whereas the receiving of Chyistes body is a farre greater mater, then to answer the Priest at Masse, if that holy bishop and Martyr had thought it so necessary, as that the Masse might not be donne without it: Doubtlesse of very reason and commensure, he would and should haue specially spoken of that, rather then of the other. But for that he thought otherwise, he required onely of necessity, the presence of two, for the purpose abone mentioned. Thus I say there. Now let vs see and consider your Replie.

Fol. 25

Iewel.

But marke wel a litle good Reader. If these two were bounde to Communicate with the priest, then not withstanding this Decree, M. Harding hath not yet founde his priuate Masse. Then consider this Decree written in the name of Pope Calixtus. *Peracta consecratione, omnes Communicent, qui noluerint ecclesiasticis carere liminibus. Sic enim & Apostoli statuerunt, & sancta Romana tenet ecclesia.* The consecration being done, let all Communicate, onlesse they wil be remoued from the Church. For so the Apostles appointed, and so holdeth the holy Church of Rome. By this Decree these two were bounde, either to Communicate with the priest, or to departe forth of the Church. If they did communicate, then hath M. Harding here no priuate Masse. If they departed forth, then could the priest say no Masse at al. For Soter at least requireth the presence of two.

De Conf.
dist. 2.

Peraclia.

The. 151.
A truth.
The Apo-
stles De-
cre exten-
deth onely
vnto the
clergie, &
bindeth
not al the
laity.

Harding.

I must now and then tel you by the way, that I seeke not for priuate Masse, whiche to finde, your scoffing pretendeth me to be despyous. I seeke not for that, which I acknowledge not. For as I haue before said, the Masse is publike and common, as Chyistes death is the publike and common benefite of the whole Church, the memorie whereof in the Masse is celebrated. That a Priest may receiue the Communion alone, in case none others be disposed to receiue with him, that is it that I proue, which you cal priuate Masse.

R R it

Jf.

A Reioindre to

Calixtus
was after
Soter,
and there-
fore his
decree can
not be ex-
tended to
Soters
time.

If the Decree that here you allege, were of Pope Calixtus, how could it bynde them of Soters time, that was made so long after? For there were almost forty yeres after the death of Soter, before Calixtus was chosen Pope. If you referre the matter to the constitution of the Apostles, vnderstand you, that it speaketh onely of them that be, ex sacerdotali Catalogo, asmuch to say, Ecclesiastical persons. Of which vocation it is not necessary they be, which Soters Decree requireth to be present. Therfore Calixtus Decree is brought in to no purpose. And so these two might answer the Priest, though they receiued not with him. Neither could they be bounde to receiue by a lawe made so long after their time. For lawes bynde for time to come, not for time past.

Againe if I sayd, that these two, after they had serued the Priest, and answered him at Masse, might go forth of the Church when the Priest receiueth the Oblation, which is at the ende of Masse: Answer were answered, and had no more directly to replye. For the lawe that forbiddeth them which do not communicate, to departe out of the Church, is to be referred to the time of receiuing, not to the time of Consecration, Oblation, and other sayers: so that they might answer the Priest at the Masse, though they taried not at the Communion: which Communion he might receiue without their presence. So although they departed forth in the ende, yet might the Priest haue vsed their necessary presence in saying Masse before. The presence of two was required at Masse, when answer was to be made, not at the receiuing of the body and bloud of our Loyde, when the office of answering was past, and had no place.

Al be it this answer might be made in consideration of

M. Jewels person, yet for the Readers sake, I had rather not to abuse his ignorance to shew of advantage, but to vse good faith, and plaimely to vtter the truth. This much then is to be said.

It is not Calixtus, but Anacletus, that made this Decree peracta Consecratione. &c. M. Jewel, as others of his syde, is deceiued by the error of Scotian. The same is oftentimes by them brought to the disproufe of the Priestes Sole receiuing, and to proue, that al the people should receiue with the Priest at euery Masse, or be dyppen out of the Churche. But the request of receiuing the Communion which in that Decree is constrained, pertaineth not to the people, but only to the Priestes, Deacons, Subdeacons, and other Ministers in solempne feastes seruing the Bishop at Masse. who so euer wil reade the first Epistle of Anacletus, from whence the Decree is taken, shal evidently see it to be so. And that the Decree is to be restrained to the clergie onely, it is cleare by the Apostles constitution Canone. 9. wherevnto Anacletus maketh relation.

Anacletus
in prima
Epist. De
cretali.
The Dec
ree of A-
nacletus
commu-
digal that
be present
to receiue,
pertaineth
only vnto
clerkes
that wait-
ed on the
bishop.

Besides al this the wordes of the Decree geue vs so to vnderstand, as they be vttered in the Original, and in Burchardus, where we finde these very wordes in the ende of the Decree; & si hoc neglexerint, degradentur, y is to say, If they wil not do this let them be degraded. Whereby it is made cleare, that it is meant onely of the clergie, who were present at the Consecration, and were admitted into Sancta Sanctorum, the holiest place of al, whither none came, but such as were in holy Orders, ἐκ τοῦ κα-
ταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικῶν, as the Canon of the Apostles termeth them.

Fol. 92.
Canonum
Apost.
Can. 9.

Whereof I haue treated sufficiently in my Constitution of the Apologie, to which place I referre the Reader.

A Reioindre to

Ieruel.

It may also stande with reason, and with the common practise of the Church at that time, that these two, whose presence Soter requireth,

M. Jew. were Priestes or Deacons, or otherwise of the clergie, and that ouer and beside the company of the people, as in dede *it is determined by the Glose. **The. 152.** And so this Decree of Soter, *agreeth with an other Decree of Anacletus made to the like purpose, that is, that the Bishop at the Ministratio haue about him a certaine number of Deacons, subdeacons, and other ministers, besides the common multitude of the lay people. And likewise with an other decree of the same Soter, that is, that euery Priest making the Sacrifice, haue by him an other Priest to assist him, and to make an ende of the Ministration if any quame or sickenes happen to fall vpon him. And this assistance of the Priest is required notwithstanding the presence of others, either of the Clerkes or of the Laitie. Now being Priestes or Clerks, and being present at the Ministration, the laye specially constrained them to receiue the holy Communion with the Minister, as it appeareth by this Decree written in the Canons of the Apostles.

The. 153. **Untruth.** It agreeth not, as here it shal appeare. **De Conf.** **dist. 1.** **vr illud.** **Can. 9.** If any Bishoppe or Priest, or Deacon, or any other of the Clerkes, after the Oblation is made, do not communicate, either let him shewe cause therof, that if it be founde reasonable, he may be excused: or if he shew no cause, let him be excommunicate. Thus who so euer these two were, whose presence Soter required, whether they were of the Laitie, or of the Clergie, the laye constrained them to receiue together with the Priest. And therefore M. Harding hath hitherto found a Communion, and no manner token or inkling of his priuate Masse.

Harding.

How hangeth **M. Jewels** Diuinitie together? How agreeth he with him selfe? He proueth and disproueth, aloweth and condemneth, what him listeth. A litle before in this very Diuision he vtterly condemned the Decretal Epistles with their Decrees. Now as though he were not the same man, he talketh

Page. 67.
M. Jew.
doublenes

kerth them to be good and of auctoritie. And allegeth them
for proufe of the practise of the Primitive Church. Now he
thinketh it no shame to take helpe of Soter, of Anacletus epistle,
of the Apostles Canons, yea of the very glose it self that is made
vpon the Decree. Thou maist see Reader, he wil playe smal
game, as they say, rather then sit out. who so euer thus de-
meaneth him selfe in questions of religion, he sheweth him selfe
to be but a sifter, and not a stedfast teacher of the truth. But
sith that he alloweth these auncient Decrees, why doth he not
recant, and yelde to the Catholike faith touching the doctrine of
the Masse, and of the blessed Sacrament in the same Decrees most
plainely and vndoubtedly anounced and set forth?

Touching the present mater, to auoide my reason that pro-
ueth the Priestes priuate and Sole receiuing, you bring a very
simple Gheasse, that the two, whose presence Soter requireth,
were Priestes, Deacons, or otherwise of the Clergie: for where
you say, that in dede it is determined by the Glose, in dede it is
falle. For al dependeth vpon *Satis viderur*, a seely coniecture: *De conf.*
which semeth not so to others, how so euer it semeth to the glose-*dist. 1. hac*
maker. Neither he semeth him selfe therein to be resolved, as *quoque in*
appearth by his obiection of the people answering Amen. *Glosa.*
Merely such a glosing determination is not of this matter a suf-
ficient proufe. And in this point, onlesse you proue that, you
saile of your purpose, and therefore ought you to yelde to the
Priestes sole receiuing, which you cal priuate Masse.

where you say, as though you had proued your former gheasse,
And so this Decree of Soter agreeth with another Decree of Anacletus,
I must tel you that which I am ashamed to say so often, that you
say false. For Soters Decree variet from that of Anacletus
in the point wherof we speake. That speaketh of a Priest at a-
ny time celebrating the Masse (of which woorde you be afrayde,

A Reioindre to

and therefore cal it the *Ministration*: this of a Bishop celebrating in a solemne feast.

Soters other Decree, wherof you would faine take a pooze holde, required not an other Priest to be in a readinesse, when so euer Masse were said, at al times, and in euery place: but onely where it might easily be done through multitude of Priests: for so be his wordes, *Vbi temporis, vel loci, siue cleri copia suffragatur*. Where there is good oportunitie so to do, by reason of time; or place, or number of Clergie.

The ninth of the Apostles Canons speaketh onely of such as be of the Clergie. And because you are not able to proue, that the two, whom Soters decree requireth to be present at Masse, ought necessarily to be of that order and vocation: it is to no purpose by you alleged. And if it were graunted vnto you, that they ought to be of the Clergie, which I do not graunt: yet by the Apostles, their forbearing from the Communion with the Priest, is admitted in case of a reasonable cause. For so saith the Canon. *Si causa rationabilis fuerit*.

Now hercof I gather this Argument, which M. Jewel by no shifte shal auoide. By Soters Decree the Priest may say Masse, if he haue onely two present to answer him: which two by M. Jewels gheasse must be of the Clergie. But those two in case of a reasonable cause be by the Apostles Decree, without punishment of excommunication permitted not to receiue the Sacrament with the Priest: Ergo where there is a case of such a reasonable cause, the Priest doth and may receiue alone. For if by any reasonable cause they that be present may be excused, what reason is there, why the Priest should be inexorable, specially where there is no default of his behalfe; and that which he hath Consecrated must nedes be receiued? And so farre is the Priestes sole receiuing, which in your schoole is private Masse, proued,

and.

*De Conf.
dist. 1. vt
illud.*

*Ca. Apost.
Cap. 9.
In Argument
whereby
the Priestes
sole
receiuing
at Masse,
which M.
Jewel cal
leth priuat
Masse, is
proued.*

and found not contrary to Chriffes Institution.

And whereas Soters Decree requireth an other Priest to be present at every Masse that is said, where the number of Priests sufficeth, that if he that hath begonne Consecration faile by chance of infirmities, the other may procede and ende the Sacrifice: if he had iudged that Chriffes Institution should be broken, except the Priest received the Sacrament with a number of others: he would haue made also a special Decree for provision in that behalfe.

Your Epiphonema at the ende of this Diuision is not truly gathered of the premisses. For al dependeth of the two that answer the Priest. whom because you can not proue, that of necessitie they ought to be of y Clergie, neither that being Laie they be bound alwaies to receiue: litle cause had you to crake? that hitherto I had not found any token or inking of that you cal the Pryuate Masse.

The. xxx. Diuision.

Here I allege the auncient Council of Agatha, where an olde Decree of Fabianus and also of the Elibertine Council was renewed: That al secular Chriffen folke should be houseled thise euery yeare, at Easter, witsontide, and Christmasse. It was there also decreed, that they should heare the whole Masse euery Sonneday, and not depart befoze the Priest had geuen blessing. Seing then the people were bound to be present at Masse euery Sonday, and to receiue the Communion but thise in the yeare: herof a coniecture not without reason may be gathered, that in some Churches, specially where the number was smal, Masse was sometime celebrated, when a sufficient company, such as y English Communion requireth, receiued not the

De Conf.
dist. 1. c. 11
ad Cele-
brandas
Missas.

CHA

ILLU

Sacra

A Reioindre to

Sacrament with the Priest. That in every final parrysh, as by commaundement of that Cosiel, they were bound to haue Masse every Sunday, so also they receiued the Communion by lawfull companies: I am sure that neither M. Jewel, nor any of his fellowes is able to proue. Unto this he replieth and saith.

Ieruel.

The. 154
but truth.
I knowe
it not.

M. Harding *knoweth wel, that these Decrees which be here allegeth, could neuer be found vwritten, neither in the Council holden at Agatha, nor at the other Council holden at Eliberis: but were set forth many hundred yeares after in the name of those Councils, by one Gratian, &c.

Harding.

As though Gratian that liued three hundred yeares before Peter Crab, who hath laid together the Canons of ech Council, as he found them in his olde copies, might not haue sent some other and truer copies of these two Councils, then came to the handes of the said Peter, when he comitted them to print. And what moneth you to deny the Decree aboue mentioned ener to haue ben found in the Council of Agatha? wil you say it is not any part of that Council because Gratian allegeth it? So may you deny many decrees, that be of most assured authoritie. And find you it not in the booke among other decrees of that Council? O say you perhaps, the booke it selfe telleth that the copie of Gemlake had in it, but. 46. Canons, wherof this is none. why say you haue you no more to say for you? Then if you refuse Gratian, because the booke of Gemlake hath it not, why may not I aswel refuse that booke, because Gratian hath it? why should Gratian be found a lyer by that copie, rather then that copie be tried to lacke by Gratian? Merely M. Jewel you utter two greates buttriches in one sentence. For neither knowe I, that this Decree was neuer wwritten in the Council of Agatha, neither is the same set forth in the name of that

that Council by the forgery of Gratian: whose iudgement in gathering you dispraise, because he hath gathered so many good testimonies of antiquitie together, whereby your heresies are confounded.

This is your maner as euer it hath ben y^e maner of heretikes, when you be not able to iustifie your false doctrine against y^e sayings of y^e fathers, then either to deny y^e fathers, or to cal their workes into doubte & question. whereby you thinke to winne, whiles you draw vs frō prouise of their doctrine, to shew prouise of their bookes. whither tendeth this impudent policie of yours, but that we should geue ouer writing against you, and wander abroad to serch libraries for prouise of bookes by you denied: which when we haue founde, yet wil you denie the same with no lesse impudencie, then now you denie the Council of Agatha alleged by Gratian. But let vs see whether you haue any better suffice then this.

Iewel.

These Decrees wil stand M. Harding in smal stede, for thus they conclude. Qui in natali Domini, Paschate, & Pentecoste non communicant, Catholici non credantur, nec inter Catholicos habeantur. They that receiue not the Communion at Christmasse, Easter, and Vvitson-
ride, let them not be taken, nor reckened for catholike people. * It appea-
reth by these general counsels, that in the vvhole church of Rome, sauing
onely a fewe Masling Priestles, there is not one man worthy to be accom-
pted catholike.

Harding.

This impudent tale and false slander hangeth of a pre-
nith gheaffe, that in the whole Catholike Church there is not so
much as one man, that receiueth the Communion at these thre
solēne feastes: which impudent surmise Metweth this man not to
care what he say, so he say y^e best belemeth y^e Rounce of him, who
is y^e Father of lying. True it is God be thanked for his grace, it

The man-
ner of here-
tikes hath
euer ben to
denie the
fathers,
or to cal
their boo-
kes in que-
stion.

De cons.
dist. 2. Secu-
lars.
The 154.
vnterth.
This is a
sclaunder-
ous lye.
For the
contrarie
is knowen
and sens.

A Reioindre to

Iohan. 8. is wel known that infinite numbers of godly persons men & women, both at these thre and sundry other leastes, do ordinarily receiue the Communion in the countries that remanie Catho like, which M. Ietwel might him selfe haue sene and knowen when he was out of the realme in Queene Maries time, had not Satan possessed him, and kept him from the companies of true beleuing people. If it shal please him to send hither any of his frendes for trial hereof, we can direct him to a citie not far from this Vniuersitie, where he may see two or thre hundred godly and deuoute persons communicate euery Sonneday, and at certaine high leastes aboue a thousand in one Church.

This last yere, which was the yere of our loyde. 1565. there were spent in Saint Gertrudes Parish here in Louaine among the Communicantes, thirty thousand thre hundred hostes. Neither is the same the greatest parish in the towne. The number of houseling people therof is about two thousand. This much haue I learned by the Pastor of that Church, who is a learned, godly, and graue man. With the like rate of number of Communicantes should I fynde in other parishes here, I doubt not, if I were disposed to examine the matter. Of this it appeareth how rashly and wickedly M. Ietwel sleaunderseth the people of God. If the Communion be so frequented in this parte of Brabant, the discrete Reader may iudge, what accompt is to be made of all Chyristendome. But this man would faine aduance his awne Synagogg by discommendation of the Church. Were it so that I fauoured his syde, I should say, pitie it is this swete Doctrine is set forth with so many and so manifest vnttruthes.

The 156.
vnttruth.
This is
not pro-
ued by
either of
them. S.
Augusti-
ne doth
not so
much as
name Ro-
me in that
place.
The 157.
vnttruth.
It is not
included.
For the
people
mighting
their offe-

Ieruel.

These Decrees can not stande with the very forme and order of the Church of those dayes. For besides that I haue already* proued by the authority of S. Hierome and S. Augustine, that the holy Communion was then ministred

sted vnto the people in Rome euery day.

Fabianus also Bisshop of Rome, hath plainly decreed, that the people should receiue the Communion euery Sonneday. His vvordes be plaine. De-
cernimus, vt in omnibus Dominicis diebus altaris oblatio ab om-
nibus Viris & mulieribus fiat, tam panis, quam vini. Vse Decree, that
euery Sonneday the oblation of the aulter be made of al men and vvemen.
both of bread and of vvine.

Here besides that in these vvordes * is included the receiuing of the co-
munion euery Sonneday, may be noted also by the vvay, that by this auto-
ristie of Fabian, men and vvemen * made the Sacrifice of the aulter, and
that of breade and vvine, and therefore after the order of Melchisedech,

Therefore * S. Bernard saith. Non solus Sacerdos sacrificat, sed totus
conuentus fidelium. Not onely the Priest sacrificeth, but also the vvhole
companie of the faithfull. These thinges vvell considered, the sense that M.
Harding vvould so faine vvring out of these Decrees, vvill seme vn-
likely.

Harding.

This Paragraph containeth good stoze of vnturthes. First, it is
not proued by S. Augustine, that the Communion was then
ministred vnto & people in Rome euery day. For as I haue be-
foze declared, in the places to that purpose alleged, he speaketh
not of Rome at al, neither speaketh he expressly of the people.
That he saith of daily receiuing of the Communion in certaine
places, may be aswel referred to the Priestes, who daily in their
Masses offered, as to the people.

But what meane you to allege Fabianus? Haue you not alrea-
dy condemned the Popes Decrees and Decretal Epistles?
If you admitte them here, you must recant al that you
spake against them befoze. If you wil that iudgement to
stande, wherby you condemned them: then riuoke that

ringes to
Churche,
though
they recei-
ued not &
sacramēt.
The. 158.
vnturth.
Fabian
both not
attribut to
the people
the ma-
king of the
Sacrifice
of the aul-
ter.

Bernar. in
serm. in die
Purificat.
The. 159
vnturth.
Bernard
saith it
not. it is

one Euer-
ricus that
saith it,
but not in
your sense
tracta 26.
in 102. &
epist. 118.

ad Ianua.
A. Jew:
alloweth
and conde-
neth De-
cretal Epi-
istles, so
we know
not where
to haue it.
page. 66.

II. iiiij you

A Reioindre to

The mar-
ke that
Mr. Jew.
shooteth
at.

you say here acknowledging them to be of good authoritie. If you reiect them in one place, and allow them in a nother place, it is a signe, you seeke not the truth, but y^e defence of your owne vntruthes. And in dede that is the marke you shoote at, how to defend your false, and insolent Challenge. which to do, you care little what you say, so you gaine say me, and seme to impugne my Answer. wherefoze from hencefozth let vs vnderstand, where to haue you. Leane not to the authoritie of those, whom you condemn: Condemne not those, to whose authoritie you leane. Els shal you be taken for a shifter, and not for a plaine dealer. Of this I warned you before, becauie your doublenesse so deserved. I trust you wil not geue me occasion of fissions to warne you of the same.

Interdecree
ta Fabia-
ni, de cr. 3.

But touching this Decree of Fabianus, you utter two fowle vntruthes at once. In these wordes (say you) is included the receiuing of the Communion euery Sonneday. How so I pray you say? which be those wordes? wil you them to be reherfed againe? Decernimus, &c. VVe Decree that vpon al the Sonnedayes the oblation of the aulter be made of al men and yremē, as vvel of bread as of vyne. Here haue we mention of the Oblation, but of the Communion to be receiued, haue we none. It is included say you. Then tel vs where it is included, for we vnderstand it not. Is it included in the bread, or in the wine? in the men, or in the women? in the aulter? or in the Oblation? or in the Sonnedayes? In any of these seuerally, or in altogether iointly? If you can not shew vs in which of these it is included, then cal backe your worde, and you shal haue leaue to tel your tale againe as the Romans (in regard of their credite) haue in Fraunce.

But you wil say perhaps, it is included in the Oblation. I deny it utterly. For the act of the Oblation is diuerse from the act

act of receiuing the Communion. In dede I confesse, that where the Sacrifice is consecrated & offered, there it must also be receiued: but of the Priest necessarily, who by his special Ministerie doth Consecrate and offer the same. The people of whose receiuing you meane, and doth not, he hath not the authoritie to Consecrate those holy Mysteries: is not so bound as often times as the Mystical Oblation is made.

Your other vnttruth reported of Fabianus Decree, is, which (you say) may be noted by the way, that men and women made the Sacrifice of the Altar, and that of bread and wine, and therefore after the order of Melchisedech. And to make your matter good, you auouch al this, by this authoritie of Fabian.

But let vs see better to your fingers. where finde you good Syr, by this authoritie of Fabian (soz so you say) that men and women made the Sacrifice of the Altar: what? make you al Late men and women Priests by this place of Fabian, and that after the order of Melchisedech? Marke say you, Fabian decreeth that euery Sunday (Altaris Oblatio ab omnibus viris & mulieribus fiat) the Oblation of the Altar be made of al men and women. Al this I graunt, yet he saith not that men and women made the Sacrifice of the Altar.

For the right vnderstanding asuel of this Decree, as of sundry sayings both of Scripture and Doctours, this much is to be considered: that there is a great difference, if we wil speake properly and exactly, betwene Oblation, and Sacrifice. It is properly called a Sacrifice when the thinge which is offered vnto God, is of the Priest altered by somewhat done in it, or vnto it, for religion sake. As for example, If he shed the blood of a beast, if he caused the incense to burne, if he brake coyne, if he sprinkled oile vpon meale, and fried it in a frying panne: then he made a

Q. I. I. made al me & we me. After the order of Melchisedech.

Great difference to be noted between Oblation and Sacrifice. A sacrifice what is it properly.

A Reioindre to

Leuit. 2.
 & 6. **Sacrifice.** For that of al these thinges there were Sacrifices
 Num. 5. made, the Scriptures in sundry places do witnesse .
 2. Para- **Oblation** properly and directly is said, when any thing
 lip 28. is offered vnto God, though nothing be done vnto it, or in it.
 Oblation, As coines of money, the two mites that the poore widow di^d
 what it is properly. cast into the tresorie, lones of bread on the Altar, &c. about
 Marc. 12. which thinges nothing is donne, and so they remaine vnalte-
 Luc. 21. red. So that euery Sacrifice is an Oblation, but euery Ob-
 Euery Sacrifice is an Oblation, but not cōtra-
 riousse. riousse.
 f rst fruites. f rst fruites.
 Deut. 26 Oblations properly to speake, because they were not offered vp
 Centhes. to God immediatly, but were geuen to the Priests the Mini-
 Oblation and gifte sters of Gods Service for their maintenance.
 taken for one thing. This difference between Oblation otherwise called a gift,
 Theophy- and Sacrifice, is very wel noted of Theophylacte. If we in-
 lactus In terprete the difference between a Gift and a Sacrifice exactly,
 Epist. ad saith he, this oddes is between them, that a Sacrifice is offered by
 Heb. c. 1. bloud and flesh: and Giftes consist of fruites, and such other
 Sacrifices are thinges as be vnbloudie or without bloud. Neither are those
 offered by bloud or thinges onely Sacrifices which are offered by bloud, but also
 fyre. such as are sacrificed by fyre. S. Paule hath obserued this
 Heb. 5. difference in his Epistle to the Hebrewes. Euery Bishop, saith
 & 8. he, is ordeined to offer vp giftes and Sacrifices: And S. Chry-
 In epist. ad some expounding those woordes of the psalme, thou woul-
 heb. ho. 18. dest not haue Sacrifice and Oblation; hath noted diligently this
 Psal. 39. difference between Oblation and Sacrifice.
 the worde Sacrifice is some times taken dy-
 If it be replied by any man, that these termes be some times confounded, and indifferently vied in the Scriptures;
 and

and that the name of Sacrifice is attributed to thinges, of which ^{metaphorically} is no such alteration made by shedding of bloud, by burning with fyre, or otherwise: To him this much be said for answer, that in such places, which in the Scriptures and Fathers be founde not seldome, the worde Sacrifice is taken Metaphorically, not properly. As when S. Paule saith, I beseech you, that you geue vp your bodies a liuely Sacrifice. Likewise the Prophete Dauid, A troubled spirite is a Sacrifice to God.

For prouise also that these termes be some times confounded and indifferently vsed, the place of Genesis is alleged. Respexit Deus ad Abel, & ad munera eius. God looked vpon Abel, and vpon his giftes. But vpon Caine, and his giftes he looked not. whereas for al that it is certaine, saith Theophylacte, that Abel offered of the first begotten of his sheepe, and Caine gaue of the frutes of the earth. Though the one made a true Sacrifice, the other gaue but giftes onely without bloud or fyre: yet both indifferently are called Munera, Giftes. For gete not (saith S. Paule) to do good and to bestowe parte of your goodes, for with suche Sacrifice God is pleased. where he calleth giftes for Gods sake geuen to men by the name of Sacrifices. But such Tropical speeches vsed in some few places, exclude not the exact and proper signification of these wordes, Oblation or giste, and Sacrifice, most commonly vsed.

Now touching S. Fabians decree, requiring the Oblation of the aulier to be made every Sunday of al men and women, as wel of bread as of wine: it meaneth, & every Sunday al faithful folke should bring their giftes and Oblations of Bread and wine to the Church. For as the Jewes, when they repaired thre times in the yeare vnto the place where God would specially be honoured, might not appeare before him with empty hands:

Rom. 12.

Psal. 50.

Gen. 4.

Heb. 11.

Sacrifice

and giste,

sometimes

are con-

founded, &

vsed indif-

ferently,

one for an

other.

In Epist.

ad heb.

cap. 1.

Giftes cal-

led Sa-

crifices.

Heb. 12.

The true

declaratio

of S. Fa-

bians de-

cre.

Deut. 16.

The cu-

stome of

offering

vpon eu-

ery Sun-

day.

A Reioindre to

so likewise the Christian people in the Primitive Church were accustomed vpon the Sondays to bring their Oblations to the common place of prayer, that is to say, portions of those thinges, with store wherof God had blessed them. Wherby they confessed and acknowledged God to be the geues of al that they had, and by rending vnto him part of his owne, they would shewe them selfe thankeful. It behoueth vs (saith S. Irenaeus) to make offering vp vnto God, and in al thinges to shew our selues thankful to God the Creator. There is a special prayer in the Masses of S. James, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostome for them that brought such Oblations vnto the Church, which because they offered them vnto God, they laid vpon the Altar, and therefore were called the Oblations of the Altar. S. James prayeth thus. *Præterea meminisce digneris Domine, eorum, qui has Oblationes obtulerunt hodierno die ad sanctum altare tuum, & pro quibus vnusquisq; obtulit, vel in mente habet. &c.* Furthermore vouchesaue to remember O Lorde them that haue offered these Oblations at thy holy Altar this present day, and them for whom ech one hath offered, or thinketh of in his minde.

*Irenaeus
lib. 4. c. 34*

*In Missa
Iacobi.*

*In Missa
Basilij.*

*What
thinges in
olde times
were com-
monly of-
fered.*

*Cā. Apost.
Can. 3.*

*Bread &
wine of-
fered, and
to what
vs.*

Likewise S. Basil in his Masse. *Memento Domine eorum, qui munera ista tibi obtulerunt, & per quos, & pro quibus obtulerunt. Remember O Lorde them, who haue offered these gifts vnto thee, and them by whom & for whom they haue offered.* S. Chrysostome in his Masse prayeth in much like manner.

What thinges were then commonly offered, it appeareth by sundry olde Decrees. Among the Canons of the Apostles, one Canon maketh mention of homie, milke, wine, birdes, beastes, puls, newe eares of corne, clusters of ripe grapes, oile, incense. Of al other thinges byead and wine was most commonly offered. Wherof parte serued for the Communion, parte for the Priestes, Deacons, and other Ministers, parte for the poore.

And

And part of the bread was cut into peeces, blessed, and after
 masse distributed unto such of the people, as were not dispo-
 sed and prepared to receiue the Communion, as it is expessed in
 a Decree of Pope Iohn the first. Those portions of bread so
 blessed, and to be distributed, were some times called Eulogie.
 This is that we call holy bread.

Now because the people that brought bread and wine with
 them, laid the same, as the manner was, upon the altar: therof
 it is, that in S. Fabians Decree, such offering is called Oblatio
 altaris, the Oblation of the altar, and not so; that the men and
 women, who offered it at the altar, made of it the Sacrifice
 of the altar, for that ministerie belongeth onely unto Priests.
 Part of it might serue to that purpose, it is not denied. But in
 that S. Jewel skipper from a common Oblation of bread and
 wine, to the Sacrifice of the altar, and auoucheth it to be made
 of lay men and women, and that after the order of Melchisedech:
 he sheweth him selfe either blindly ignorant, or maliciously
 despising the most blessed Sacrifice.

And whereas to bolster by that wicked and prophane Do-
 ctrine, he allegeth S. Bernard as saying thus in sermone in die
 Purificationis, Non solus Sacerdos sacrificat, sed totus compen-
 tus fidelium: Not onely the Priest sacrificeth, but also the whole
 companie of the faithful: the matter is some answered. First S.
 Bernard saith it not. They be the wordes of one Guerricus Ab-
 bas Igniacensis in a Sermon made in die purificationis. Next
 I confesse, that in a righe sense, as this Sacrifice is called the Sa-
 crifice of the Church, so the faithful people may be said to offer
 it and to Sacrifice, but farre otherwise, then the Priest. For that
 which is specially and in outward act offered by the ministerie of
 the Priest, is donie vniuersally by the bowe of the faithful peo-
 ple. And so doth not onely the Priest offer a sacrifice, but also al
 the

Holy bre-
 ad, and
 the vse of
 it.

Inter decre-
 ta Pij, De-
 creto. 9.

Oblation
 of the al-
 ter, where-
 of it is
 so called
 before con-
 secration.

S. Jew.
 sheweth
 him selfe a
 prophane
 despiser of
 the blessed
 Sacrifice.

Ad finem
 operum
 Dini Ber-
 nardi.

A Reioindre to

the faithful. Therefore it is said in the Masse, Memento Domine, pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerant. Remember them O Lord, for whom we offer, or who do offer unto the, &c. So S. Augustine, tam ipsa per ipsam, quam ipse per ipsam fuerat offerri: Aswel is the Church (saith he) woont to be offered by vnto God through Christe, as Christe through the Church. But that every one of the people both men and women in their owne person do outwardly and ministerially consecrate the body and bloud of Christe, and so offer and make the Sacrifice of the altar after the order of Melchisedech: Neither is it signified by the Decree of the blessed Martyr S. Fabian, neither was it euer before M. Jewels Replie came forth, with such impudencie reported.

More over when did S. Augustine, S. Hierome, S. Chrysostome, or any other learned Father or Doctour of that age euer use this manner of speache, audire Missas, to heare Masse?

Harding.

It is a shame for one that despyeth so much the name of a learned man, so commonly to deduce his argumentes, ab authoritate negative, which manner of arguing is of little force. what if they be not so to speake, shal we therefore abolish the thing? None of them al euer said, that M. Jewel is a true man: what then? shal we thereof conclude, that M. Jewel is a false Iper? Be the argument neuer so good in mater, yet in forme it is naught. And yet is it as good as that M. Jewel maketh here.

levvel.

Certainly this phrase was so farre unacquainted, and unknown in that worlde, that the very Originals of these Decrees haue it not, but onely haue these wordes: tenere Missas, to holde Masse: as may be seen in the booke of Councils noted purposely in the margin.

Harding.

Harding.

what the very Originals haue, you ghesse rather then knowe. For if the true Originals had had tenere, and not audire, then would Peter Crab haue caused the booke to be printed: els you make him a falsifier. with which crime I throw, you of al men wil not charge him. Very euil should it become you being so notorious a falsifier your selfe. And why beleue you rather y^e note of the margent, then the text it selfe? yea why condene you al the booke of Gratian, that so haue it? May we not beleue Gratian, as well as the note made, we know not by whom?

De conf.
dist. 1. Mis-
sas die Do-
minico.

Iewel.

The Italians this day seme to speake farre better. For of them that heare Masse, and vnderstand not what they heare, they say, Videre Missas, that is, not to heare, but to see Masse.

Harding.

So, as euil as you can atway with the phrase, yet here you vse it your selfe. so haue you vsed it in sundry places of your Replie both before this place gaue occasiō, as pag. 37. 39. and after, pag. 74. 85. 92. 479. And yet do not you repoynt truly of Italians, as good an Italian as you are. For they say not videre Missas, to see Masses, in the plural number, but veder la Massa, to see the Masse, in the singular number, vnderstanding thereby the Divine Oblation, which they haue learned (as Villagagnon writeth) in the Syrian tongue to be called by the name of Masse. And so say they of them that vnderstand what they heare, as well as of them, that vnderstand not.

In libello
gallico des-
chofes con-
sentieuses
contre Cal-
nine. ca. 311

The Masse, as it is taken not only for the Sacrifice it selfe, but also for the whole seruice, so it consisteth in action, and in wordes. In respect of the one it may well be said, that it is sene, in respect of the other, that it is heard, and so certaine ancient Fathers haue spoken, whom I shal allege hereafter. So where the Italians say, they haue sene Masse, the English, French, and

Both
phrases to
see, and to
heare
Masse;
may well
be vsed in
diuerse re-
spect.

and

A Reioindre to

and Douth, they haue heard Masse: in diuerse respect al say wel, neither is there any iust cause, why you should fynde fault with the maner of speech. But what shal I multiplie wordes about these two phrases, whether is better, to say, I haue sene Masse, or, I haue heard Masse, is you, who ca not abide neither doing, nor saying, neither seing, nor hearing the Masse, nor any other part of Diuine Seruice, as it is donne in the Catholike Church? Yet remember, al this quarreling that you make for hearing Masse, toucheth not me, but Gratian, and the auncient Fathers assembled in Councel at Agatha, whose speech it is, and were neuer hitherto blamed for it.

*In epi. Fe-
licis. 4.
De cons.
dist. 2. Si-
cut non a-
lij.*

Neither is the phrase audire Missam, to heare Masse, so stränge as you beare the worlde in hande. Felix vseth it in his Epistle to the Bishops of diuerse prouinces. whose wordes these be. Satijs ergo est, Missam non cantare, aut non audire, quam in locis illis ubi fieri non oportet, nisi pro summa contingat necessitate, quoniam necessitas non habet legem. It is better therefore not to sing Masse, or not to heare it at al, then in those places, where it ought not to be donne, oulesse it happen for very great necessitie, for necessitie hath no lawe. Againe the learned Father S. Germanus a Greke Doctor, writing vpon S. James Masse, vseth this phrase in these wordes. Mentis nostras firmas habentes audiamus mysticum & viuificum Sacrificium. Hauing our myndes stedfast, let vs heare the mystical and liuegining Sacrifice, so he calleth y^e Sacrifice of the Masse. S. Chrysostome speaking of those y^e were unworthy to receiue y^e blessed Sacrament, saith, indigni sunt oculi istiusmodi spectaculis, indignæ aures. The eyes be unworthy of these sightes, unworthy be the eares. By which wordes he sheweth hi selfe to like the phrase of hearing these holy mysteries, or hearing the Masse. For whereof be the eares that he speaketh of unworthy, but of hearing the Masse?

*Germanus
in con-
sid. rerum
ecclesiasti-
carum.
Chry. in
epist. ad
Eph. hom.
3 et ad po.
Antioch.
Hom. 16.*

In the Councel of Cabilonum, which M. Jewel allegeth in the last Division of this Article, we haue þ phrase of hearing Masse. Audiunt Missas, that is to say, they heare Masse, is twise founde in the 19. chapter of that Councel.

Now you enter into a common place not necessary, to proue that hearing without understanding anasleth nothing. And here, you thinke to shew great learning by shuffling together Scripture and humanitie, Chyriste, and Cicero, Apostles, and Aristotile, the olde Testament, and the Civile Lawe. Out of which is brought in one Titius like the man in the Moone, or John at Rokes. Then commeth forth Alciato the Lawyer that dyed of late, to strike the stroke. Last of al one Epicharmus a philosopher closeth vp the matter, and endeth the tedious bible bable made of the sense of hearing, that a man would be loth to heare.

That hearing without understanding anasleth nothing, an vnecessary common place handled by M. Jewel.

In al that large processe your purpose is to perswade, that Christen people by being present in the Church, when the Masse is celebrate, are neuer the better, because they understand not what is donne and said, for that they know not the tongue wherein the Masse is said. But herein you deceiue them that beleue you M. Jewel. For though the common Prayer of the Church uttered by the mouth of the Priest be not perfectly understood of the people, yet may it be profitable vnto the, specially if they haue a general knowledge of the thing that is asked, of him of whom it is asked, and through whom it is asked. Neither is it necessary they understand what so euer the Priest saith. For they may be partakers of his Prayers, though they perceiue not ne heare not distinctly al that he saith.

The faithfull people receiue benefit by the prayers of the Church, though they understand not the tongue they be made in.

It was straitly commanded by our Lorde, that no man should be in the Tabernacle, when the high Bishop entered into the holy place, to pray for him selfe, for his house, and for the

Leui. 16.

A Reioindre to

whole companie of Israel. Now although the people neither heard nor sawe, what the Bishop said or did in the holy place, yet they knew in a generalitie, that he prayed for them, and thought them selfe partakers of his publike Prayer and Sacrifice. In the day of the Iourification, the high Bishop Sacrificed in the holy place for the synnes of the people, at what time they stode al withour, during the time of the incense, as S. Iude declared speaking of Zacharie.

Luc. 1.

2, Paral.
26. Sc. 25.

David ordeined that God should be praised with certaine musical Instruments; and appointed certaine Leuites to serue in that Office, commanding them to sing and play on their instruments in the morning and at evening every day, and at al solemne feastes, according to the rite and custome of every feast. who dareth say, the people were not partakers of these praises of God, and prayers? Yet the people understode not in particular every Observation of the Sanctuarie or holy place, nor al the Psalmes that so were Daily song. But you will see with the wordes of S. Chrysostome, and of S. Ioule, where you say thus,

Chrysost.
in 1. Cor.
14. 25.

Ierrol.

Chrysostome speaking of him that beareth the prayers in a strange unknown tongue, saith thus. Tu recte oras, Spiritu scilicet concitatus sonas: sed ille nec audiens, nec intelligens ea quae dicis, paruam ex ea re utilitatem capit. Thou prayest well, for thou soundest wordes being moued by the spirit: but the vnlearned neither hearing nor understanding, what thou saist, hath thereby smal profite. Like wise saith S. Paul, Qui loquitur lingua, non hominibus loquitur, sed Deo: Nullus enim audit. He that speaketh with tongue, speaketh not vnto men, but vnto God for noman beareth him.

That

that S. Paule in the 14. Chapter of the first to the Co-
 rinthians speaketh not against hauing the Service
 of the Church in a learned tongue.

Harding.

They that in this Age haue cut them selues from the
 Church, proceeding out of Martine Luthers Schoole, haue
 neuer donne with this place of S. Paule to the Corintheans,
 thinking to haue a greate aduantage against the Catholikes,
 for that they haue the Masse and their other diuine Service in
 the Latine tongue. which they affirme to be quite contrarie
 to the Doctrine of S. Paule. wherefoze it shal be to good
 purpose here to declare, that of the wordes which the blessed
 Apostle there uttereth, nothing can be gathered, whereby the
 auncient custome of the Catholike Church making Sacrifice,
 prayers, and praise to God in the Latine tongue, may
 seeme to be reppoued. For better declaration herof I wyl not
 be ashamed to vse some parte of that a graue and a lear-
 ned man one of the Readers of this Vniuersitie hath noted
 touching this point. Verely the onely thing which S. Paule
 forbiddeth, is this, that in the common assemblie of the Church,
 no man speake with a tongue utterly vnknoten, and such
 as no other person vnderstandeth, except there be an inter-
 preter, who may expounde what is said, to them that vnder-
 stand not. For this is to be considered, that among the
 Corintheans for the gite of Tongues one swelled againste
 an order, and preferred (very vnwisly) this gite before
 other more profitable and more excellent gites, as though by
 the same they had ben like vnto the Apostles, who vpon the
 fifth day after our Lordes Resurrection receiued the gite of
 tongues, as S. Chrysostome noteth.

what is
 that S.
 Paul say-
 biddeth.
 1. Cor. 14

In 1. Cor.
 12 & 14

A Remindre to

In com-
ment. in
1. Cor. 14

S. Ambrose also (or who so ever he was that wrote the Comen-
taries which beare his name) saith further, y there were certain
Hebrewes at Corinth, who sometimes in their treatises or Orla-
tions used the Syrian tongue, and most commonly the Hebrew
tongue, therby to winne commendation. For they esteemed not
a litle to be called Hebrewes, for the merites sake of Abraham.
As if now our, to shew that he could do a wonder, would at
the divine Service openly pronounce a Psalm in Hebrew, or
say Masse in Greeke.

Now for this cause S. Paul would not that any m^a spake
with an unknown tongue at the meeting of the faithful toge-
ther, except there were one to interpret it forthwith, because his
wordes could not so be bozne in memorie, as their interpretation
might be differred until a convenient time to be expounded by a
sermon, and it was uncertaine what enery one spake with the
1. Cor. 14 unknown tongue. Therfore in the same place he commaundeth,
that when the Prophetes, that is to say the expositours, haue de-
clared it, the others do iudge of it, meaning such as haue the gife
to discern spirits, that if they saw that which was spoken with
the unknown tongue, was to be reiected, they should reiect it, if
they saw, it was to be approued, they should approue it.

It is to be noted, that where S. Paul commendeth prophe-
syng, that is, expounding of the scriptures, he saith, the Church
is edified by prophesying: And where he describeth the gife of
tongues the gife of interpretation seclused, there he saith, that
no man vnderstandeth the tongue. He that speaketh with tongue
1. Cor. 14 (saith he) speaketh not vnto men, but vnto God. For no man
heareth, that is to say, no man vnderstandeth. And againe. If
thou blesse with the Spirite, how shal he that supplieth the roome
of the idiote (by which worde S. Paul meaneth not a fool,
as commonly we meane: but such a one as knoweth no lay-
guage

gnage, but only his owne vulgar language,) say Amen, at thy blessing, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest. Loe, he speaketh of a tongue utterly unknown, which no man in the Church understandeth, no not he who being better learned then the rest, is wonte to answer Amen for the Idiot. And here it is specially to be marked, that the Apostle saith not, the Idiot or unlearned person understandeth not thy blessing, but, he that supplieth the room. (saith he) of the Idiot or unlearned person. which is an other manner a thing, then to say, Idiot, the Idiot or unlearned person, as it hath ben diligently noted by certaine Doctours, specially Iohannus, Bala- mo, and Hieronimus Lombardus. For in these wordes S. Paule putteth before his eyes as it were the manner of the Jewes, and doth allude to the fashion of their Ceremonies. For in the beginning of the Synagogue, before the people were increased, the whole people was wont to answer Amen, and what so ever els was to be answered by the people at the holy Ceremonies. But after that Dauid had appointed synging men, then began they pecularly to answer at the rites of the Sacrifices. Yea the inferiour priests answered the high priest, as thereof we read in the booke of the Machabees, Oratione faciebant omnes sacer-
dotes, dum consummaretur sacrificium, Ionatha inchoante, ce-
teris autem respondentibus. All the priests made prayer, whiles the Sacrifice was a doing, Ionathas began, & the rest answered. And because it was commanded by Moyses lawe, that the Jewes, as they made their Oblations, should speake certaine wordes before the priest, and no other tongue was used at Sa-
crifice but the Hebrew, and many both Jewes dispersed abroad among the Gentiles, and specially Iosephus, who came from Gentilitie to the religion of the Jewes, knewe not the Hebrew tongue, and yet came oftentimes to offer in the Temple: some
were.

A Reiohnre to

were founde to supplie the roome of these vnlearned persons called in Greke by S. Paul. Idiotes and to speake without for them, and to answer Amen. As in final parrishes the Deacon, Clerke or Sexton maketh answer in at the seruice in the name of the whole people: so whereas long before at the beginning of the Church, the whole people was wont to sing, afterward in a Council holden at Laodicea about the yere of our Lorde. 370. it was ordeined, that none should sing prater canonicos Plakes, but Canonical singers, that is to say, such as by rule and common order were appointed to be the singing men in Churches. These appointed by rule to sing, be they, whom by S. Pauls doe supplie the roome of the vnlearned people, whom for that they speake but with one private and special tongue, and know not the Common tongue, as Greke or Latine, and for the most parte be vnlearned, S. Pauls language calleth Idiotes, which is no odious name nor terme of contempt, howsoever it sound otherwise in our common English speache.

Now then as S. Pauls saith in the beginning, that no man understandeth him that speaketh with tongue, so here he saith, that neither he which supplieth the roome of the Idiote or vnlearned person, can answer Amen after the blessing of him that speaketh with an unknown tongue, because he knoweth not what he saith, whether it be true or false, good or euil, forasmuch as he him selfe who is of more cunning and knowledge then the Idiotes or vnlearned persons, understandeth not the tongue wherein the prayer is made.

Thus then there appeareth a great and manifold difference between that which the Apostle forbod so to be done among the Corinthians, & that which of custome is commonly done in the Church. Where saith he, no man heareth, and he that supplieth the roome of the Idiote, knoweth not what thou sayest. Where altho

Concil.
Leo. licen.
ca. 15.

I compa-
rison be-
tween the
state of the
Church
and
the church
now, when
in great
distress
it ap-
peare.

be of the Clergy vnderstand the latin tongue, and they that an-
swer in heede of the lay people, vnderstand wel ynough what the
priest sayeth, yea many of the lay folke them selfe be not utterly
ignorant of the Latine tongue. There through the unknowne
tongue no man was furthered to pittie, as S. Paule speaketh,
an other is not edified. But here both the clergy is edified, and is
taught what they ought to deliuer vnto the people. There were
spoken in an unknowne tongue, thinges vncertaine, and such
as were yet to be discerned: Here nothing is read or long,
which before hath not ben assuredly appoyned, and taken eider
out of the holy scriptures, or authentical Doctours. There the
interpretation could not be differred, because the wordes passed
away, and could not be kept in memoire: Here al thinges be re-
hearsed out of wyting, and the interpretation is differred vntil a
conuenient tyme, that when the people assemble the selfe together,
what so euer concerneth them, may be expounded vnto them.
There vaine prasse was sought for childishly by a strange & un-
knowne tongue: Here in a most common and knowne tongue
God is heauenly praised and prayd vnto.

To conclude, among the Corinthians things were donne with confusion, and by occasion of the tongues the necessarie instruction of the people was let and hindered, insomuch that if, as it were speaking with unknown tongues, Infidels or Idolaters had come into the assemblies, they would have thought it to be madde and out of their wits. But now as the state of the Church is ordered, all things be donne orderly, & the divine Service is with such order & discipline, that the preaching of Sermons thereby suffereth no hindrance: And if Infidels or Idolaters (whom St. Iohn calls so) come into our Churches, they be offended rather that the Clergie sing negligently and loosely, than that they sing in Latine.

A Reioindre to.

These things being wel considered, it shal appeare plaine I doubt not, that, what so euer S. Paule writeth against speaking with Tongue amonge the Corinthians, or S. Chrysostome in his Commentaries vpon that place: it maketh nothing for disproof of the Latine tongue vsed in the Sacrifice and other Diuine Service of the Latine Church. This much for answer to your long vnnecessarie proccesse against the terme of hearing Masse.

Ieruel.

Now let vs see, what M. Harding gathereth out of these two Councils. Then of like (saith he) specially in smal townes and villages, they had Masse without the Communion of many together. Of like was neuer good Argument in any Schooles.

Harding.

Yea Sir, Aristotle the chiefe Maister that euer Schooles had, teacheth, that Argumentes be many times made of coniectures and likelihoodes. Such of him be called *τεκμήρια*. Read his second Booke De arte dicendi, and there shal you finde this manner of reasoning handled. Looke where he treateth, De Argumentis factum coniectura ostendentibus. If the coniecture be probable, the Argument is probable. And for proufe of a fact, which to proue is harde, it is sufficient to bring a probabilitie. Now forasmuch as whether any Priest said Masse without communicantes within the first six hundred yeares, that you make so much a do for, is questio facti, as they say, and not iuris: If I can shewe it by any probable Argument, I do that belongeth to duettie in this case. The Coniecture is this.

De Arte
dicendi. lib.
2. cap. 35.

Concil. A-
gathen.
cap. 18.

Because the people withdrew them selfe much from receiving the Communion, it was decreed by the Council of Agatha, as it was long before by S. Fabian the Pope, and also by the

the Council Eliberrine as Gratian recorderth, that so many as would not receiue at the three solemne feastes, Christmasse, Easter, and witsonside, should not be accompted for Catholike. yet was it by the same council commaunded, that the people should holde, heare, or see Masses (let M. Jewel chooseth of thes three ceremonies which he liketh best) euery Sonneday, & not depart befoze blessing were given.

De cons.
dist. 2. So-
cularis.
De cons.
dist. 2.
Omnis ho-
mo. Conc.
Agathen.
cap. 47.

This compulsion of the people to receiue at the three feastes of the yere, argueth a negligence and a drawing backe from the vse of the Communion at other times. If this be presupposed, whether as they were excused in case they receiued at the said three feastes onely, and yet were bounde to be at Masse euery Sonneday: I report me to any man that is not contentious, whether herof a probable coniecture may not be gathered, that at the Masse of some Sonnedayes the priest had small, yea rather no companie to receiue the Communion with him, specially in such places where the Churches had but fewe people. For if the people had been disposed to receiue by convenient numbers euery Sonneday, then should the fathers of that Council haue had no cause at all to make that straight Decree. But seeing you make light of what so euer is not proued by a strong demonstration, this argument here I proponde vnto you, which is as good as a coniectural matter permitte to make.

What so euer people be loth to do, & do not but by compulsion of lawe: if doing therof they may reasonably be thought to omit, at least sometime, when the lawe setteth the at libertie. But to receiue the Communion euery Sonneday they were loth (for else the lawe compelling them to receiue this in the yere had been needlesse) & had libertie to forbear, so they receiued at the said three solemne feastes: Ergo, it is not besides reason to thinke of this, that they forbore to receiue at least some Sonnedayes in the yere. Wth graunt of this, I procede further, & say, They forbore to receiue

In argu-
ment to
proue p^{re}-
sunte
that
it in ma-
ter conie-
ctural.

A Reuindred to

some Sonnedales, but they had Masse every Sonneday: ergo, they had Masse, when they receiued not with the Priest. And so farre is that proued, which you cal private Masse.

*An other
argument
for the sa-
me.*

Again, If the Masse may not be donne, except a companie receiue the Sacrament with the Priest: when it appeareth, that the Fathers of Agatha Councel were vniuersal and vniuersal men. But it is not to be thought of so grane, so learned, so godly, & so wise Fathers: Ergo, the Masse may be done without companie receiuing with the Priest. If any of the promises be to be doubted of, it is the maior, or first proposition. But the same, thus I proue,

who so euer maketh a law for a thing to be done, and omitteth to prouide for the meanes without which the thing can not be done: he is an vniuersal & an vniuersal lawemaker. But the Fathers of Agatha Councel, as also they of the Councel of Elbertine, and S. Fabian, made a law and Decree, that the Masse should be done every Sonneday in the yere, and tooke no order for the people, or convenient companie of the people, to receiue the Sacrament at every Masse with the Priest, without the which the Masse can not be done after your doctrine, but leaue them to their libertie: Ergo, those Fathers were vniuersal & vniuersal men. But you may not condene those grane, wise, holy, & learned Fathers, neither reiect the anothoritie of that assent Councel: For by your owne Challenge you haue bound your self to stand vnto it, & to allow it, because it was holden within the first six hundred yeres after Christ: what remaineth then, but that you graunt, which must needs be graunted, that Masse might be done without a companie receiuing the Sacrament together with the Priest.

Certainly if those Fathers had ben of your opinion, and had ben perswaded, the Masse might not be done without a number receiuing with the Priest, whereas they decreed Masse to be done every Sonnday: they would & should also haue made a special ordinance for such numbers and companie of Communicantes
alwaies

alwaies to be in a readinesse. which forasmuch as they did not, thereof it is euident, that Masse may be celebrate, though there be none disposed to receiue the Communion with the Priest. And thus is that you terme private Masse, proued.

level.

But what if the very wordes of these Councils, whereupon M. Harding hath founded his Masse, make manifest proufe against his Masse? The wordes be these: Al Secular Christian folke, be bounde to receiue the Communion at the least thrise in the yere.

* This Relaxation or priuilege is graunted onely vnto the Secular Christians. whereof it foloweth necessarily, that al Ecclesiastical persons, as Priests, Deacons, Clerkes, and others what so euer of that sorte were not excepted, but stood fast bounde to receiue orderly, as they had donne before: and that was at al times when so euer there was any ministratiō.

And so by the plaine wordes of these Councils the Priest receiued not alone: neither hath M. Harding yet founde out his private Masse.

Harding.

There is neither truth in your wordes, nor reason in your argumentes. The wordes of the Decree be not as you report them, but somewhat otherwise. The Seculars (saith that Council) that wil not Communicate at Christmasse, Easter, and VVitsontide: let them not be beleued to be Catholike, neither let them be accompted among the Catholikes. These wordes, as euery man may see, import not a Relaxation or priuilege graunted onely vnto the Secular Christians as you say, but a punishment binding them to do that of necessity at certaine times, which was at al times left before to their deuotiō. so that it is a bond of it self, & confirmatiō, not a relaxatiō or release of a bonde or dutie, which you presuppose. Being therefore a Decree made ad augmentū as f lawpers say, it can not import diminutiō or relaxatiō. For f one cause cā neuer bying forth contrary effectes. This Decree therefore bindeth f seculars to more then by necessity of positiue

DD 4 lawe

The. 160
vnto truth.
These be
not the
wordes of
the Coun-
cil.

The. 161.
vnto truth.
It is nei-
ther Rela-
xation nor
priuilege.
It is a
point an-
nexed in
case of con-
tempt.

The. 162:
vnto truth.
Ecclesiastical persons were not at al times bounde to receiue to hen the Sacri-
fice was offered, as it appareth by the canons of the Apostles. can. 9. and otherwher.

Conc. Aga-
sten. c. 47
De conf.
dist. 2.
Seculares.

A Reioindre to

Relaxatio
or priuile:
ge.

lawe they were bounde vnto before, and for the stratter obserua-
tion of the same thereto a paine is annexed in case of contem-
pte or transgression, which is not the nature of a relaxation or pri-
uilege. For a relaxation or priuilege is euer graunted to release
the rigour of the lawe, or any bonde or burthen, for the fauour,
ease, and benefite of the partie to whom it is graunted.

Chrys. ad
heb. ho. 17.
Ambr. li. 5.
de Sacra.
cap. 4.
August. de
verb. Do-
mi. secund.
Luc. hom.
23.

And whereas by a priuilege there is an exemption graunted
out of the common lawe: it becometh you to shewe vs, that by the
common lawe al were bounde to receiue the communion euery
day, or euery Sonneday. If al had ben bounde to receiue euery
day, or euery Sonneday, or so often as the Masse was celebrated:
what meane the Fathers, namely S. Chrysostome, S. Ambrose,
and S. Augustine, where they speake of the Sacrament either but
once in the yere receiued, or but once in two yeres, or very seldome
receiued: to speake so coldely of it, and not sharply to rebuke the
offenders for breaking a thing commaunded by a comon lawe?
Most certaine it is, if it had ben a law, they would neuer haue so
wincked at it, their pulpites in that age should haue rung of it, &
their bokes at this day should haue spokt of it. Yea wher they re-
ceiued not daily, but seldome, S. Augustine saith, they caused there-
by none offence to be taken, neither were they by the gouernours
of the Church commaunded to do otherwise, and wher they obe-
yed not their request therein, yet for the same they were not con-
demned.

De Sermo-
ne Domi-
ni in man-
te. lib. 2.
cap. 12.

Seeing then there was no such common lawe, commaunding
al persons to receiue euery day, or euery Sonneday, or when so
euer the Masse was celebrated: it is besides al truth and reason,
that this Decree of Agatha Councel requiring and compelling
vnder a great penaltie the seculars to receiue the Sacrament at
the foyrtaio threer feastes at least, should be taken for relaxation or
priuilege.

Your

M. Iowels Replie.

Your growne then thus proued false, that you say foloweth thereof necessarily, foloweth not at al: that is to say, it foloweth not of your false pretended priuiledge, that al Ecclesiastical persons receiue with the Priest, when so ever there is Masse celebrated: which Masse you refuse to name, though it be often in ancient Councils, euen in those also which your selfe do allege and cal it by your common ministring worde of Administration.

But what meane you, where you mention Ecclesiastical persons, to adde by way of exposition, *As Priests, Deacons, Clerkes and others, vvhich are of that sorte?* Acknowledge you any Ecclesiastical persons besides Priests and Deacons? If you do, why haue ye not the in your Aggregations? what make you of Clerkes, a distinct order? If they be not distinct from Ecclesiastical persons, why reckon you them as though they were a kinde of holy order by them selfe, as Priests and Deacons are? Again, why put you into your reckning and diuision of Ecclesiastical persons, that other general worde *others*? If you acknowledge the primitive Church to haue had the other holy orders, which the Church now hath, to witte, Subdeacons, Acolytes, &c: why cal you not them by their names? Be you so fine in your new Gospel, that you be ashamed to utter the names, whereas you acknowledge the thinges by the names signified? But it appeareth manifestly, that you care little what you say; so you seme to gaine say me, and to haue some matter of apparent advantage against the pointes of my Answer to your Challenge.

These Ecclesiastical persons say you, were bound to receiue with the Priest, and did alwaies receiue with him, when so ever Masse was celebrated: hereof you conclude, *the Priests neuer receiued alone, and M. Harding hath not yet founde out his private Masse.* But Sir, a worde with you. First, you haue not yet proued, that al Ecclesiastical persons were bounde to receiue,

A Reioindre to

Obi-
sration.

In the
new En-
glish Co-
munion
booke,

when so ever there was any administration, for in that word you have great desire, when you speake of the Masse. And although it were granted you, yet how wil you proue, that there were Ecclesiastical persons in every parish, in every Church and Chappel, were it neuer so smal? was there no Church or chappel, where it was lawful to haue the Masse, but in the same also were either other Priests, or Deacons (for other Ecclesiastical persons besides these your Gospel acknowledgeth not) and they of such number as might make vp a lawful Communion? Do you not require three at least besides the Priest to receiue with him, be the parish neuer so smal?

How say you then, can you proue, that there were these Priests or Deacons at the least in every Church and Chappel, where the Masse was celebrated, beside the Priest that offered the Sacrifice? Can you proue there was so great multitude every where of such Ecclesiastical persons, before the time of the Council of Agatha? If every Church were not furnished with such a companie, as doubtlesse it was not, wherwas the Masse was of necessitie notwithstanding to be celebrated every Sunday, for thereto they were bounde by a straight lawe: what can you answer Mr. Jewel for a reasonable escape, that the Masse was not there done vpon sundry Samedayes without companie receiuing the Communion with the Priest?

That the Seculars receiued not, it is before proued, and by Mr. Jewel graunted, for els the Decree binding them to receiue at the three feastes had been void and needlesse: that there was Masse every Sameday among them, it is not denied, and the Decree of this Council inferreth it. But that in every Church where Masse was donne, there were at al times three other Priests or Deacons at the least, besides the Priest that celebrated, to receiue the Communion with him, there is no probable reason

reason, nor so much as a conjecture leading us to believe, what followeth them of this, but that in Churches which lacked such number of priests and Deacons, they had Masse very often without a companie receiving the Communion with the priest, which M. Jewel calleth private Masse.

Now concerning the other point, I have already said.

But that the whole matter may the better appear, not by shew of sayings, but by the very Ecclesiastical order of that age, we must understand that these and such other like Decrees were made, not for the greatest parte of the people, * that in those daies used to Communicate in all their assemblies, but for a few that were negligent, and haled backe. For otherwise the general order doth very well appear, by * all the Ecclesiastical recordes of that time.

Harding.

Now taketh M. Jewel the whole matter into his owne hands, and promisseth to put all out of doubt. And will you know how? Forsooth not by shew of sayings, but by a manifest lie. He must understand, saith he. Now that he hath none other shift to avoid the pious of private Masse, he seeketh how to escape by a new devised understanding, and telleth his Reader, he must understand a false point or two, which if he understand & believe for certainie, it shall appeare unto him, that then there was no private Masse. Well then, what is that we must understand? That the greatest parte of the people in those daies used to Communicate in all their assemblies. That therefore these and such other like Decrees were not made for them, but for a few negligent fellows that haled backe.

But how is this proved? For so it doth very well appear by all the Ecclesiastical recordes of that time.

So then the trial of this matter dependeth of 2 recordes. It doth well appear by the recordes of that time, saith M. Jewel, that the greatest part of the people used in those daies to communicate in all their assemblies.

D. D.

Macke

The. 1631
Dnr urh.

The greatest parte of the people at that time used not to communicate in all their assemblies as it is here proved.

The. 164
Dnr urh.
By saying Ecclesiastical recordes the contrary appeareth as here is shewed.

A Rejoinder to

Marke wel what he saith reader. upon y^e graue I reason thus. If the greatest part of y^e people used the sacrament in al their assemblies, for asmuch as they were bound to be at Mass every Sunday, as y^e decree made to y^e end above mentioned commanded: then it followeth, y^e they received the Communion every Sunday. And then further. If they received the Communion every Sunday, how was not the Decree superfluous, that commanded them to receive at least thise in the yere? For what is commanded by a new lawe to be done, is presupposed not to have ben done before.

Mr. Jewel should have done wel, if he had alleged those recordes for his credite sake, which is not grown so greate yet, that we may beleue him upon his bare worde. Certaine it is, the recordes of that age be quite contrary. S. Chrysostome in whose age this Council of Agatha was kept as some thinke, oftentimes complaineth of the peoples slacknesse in coming to the Communion. He rebuketh them sharply for that they could not be brought to Communicate oftener, but looked for some holy tide, as for Adwent, the Epiphanie, or Lente. In one place he saith thus. In alijs quidem temporibus cum puri frequenter sitis, non acceditis, in Pascha vero licet sit aliquid a vobis patratum, acceditis. At other times when as ye are for the more parte pure and cleane, ye come not to Communicate, but at Easter, yea, though ye have done somewhat amisse, yet ye come. At length he cryeth out, Sacrificium frustra quotidianū. In cassum assistimus altari, nullus qui Communicetur. Ye have daily Sacrifice to no profit, we stand at the aulter in vaine, there is none to be houseled, or to be Communicated.

Again in an other place he uttereth a manifest recorde of the greatest parte of the peoples forbearing the Communion, with these wordes. Plurimi ex Sacrificio semel accipiunt in toto

anno,

That the
more part
of y^e people
received y^e
sacrament
scidome in
the age of
y^e Council
of Agatha
Chrysost.

ad Rom.
Antioche.
Hom. 61.

In epist.
ad heb.
hom. 17.

anno, alij his, alij Scipius. The greatest parts of the people receiveth this Sacrifice, but once in the whole yere, some twice, some oftener.

S. Ambrose doth both witness that they of the East church used to Communicate but once in the yere, and blameth them of the West Church, that folowed them. Si quotidianus est cibus, cur post annum illum sumis, quemadmodum Græci in Oriente facere consueverunt? If it be our daily foode (saith he) speaking of the body of Christ really present in the Sacrament) why receivest it but once in the yere, as the Brekes use to doe in the East? S. Augustine recordeth the same in two sundry places.

Now what remaineth good reader, but that thou lay these witnesses in a balance? M. Jewel saith, the greatest parte of the people in those dayes used to Communicate in al their assemblies. S. Chrysostome saith, the greatest parte of the people received this Sacrifice but once in the whole yere. With S. Chrysostome is S. Ambrose, and also S. Augustine, who say likewise, that they of the East used to receive the body of Christ but once in the yere. These grave and holy fathers lived in that age of Agatha Council, and say quite contrary to M. Jewel. They have no affection at that time to prove any thing they had affirmed by any stout Challenge made to al the worlde, as to saying they went not about to defend their honoure & estimation, when they wrote this, they contended with no man as it were for the garland, but spake soothly as they knewe: M. Jewel on the other side, it is wel known, what an enterprise he hath taken in hand, how much it standeth him upon & the maine of his cause, to uphold his Challenge. Now saith thou reader, whose witness sayest thou more, M. Jewels, or these holy Fathers?

Wherefore that being false, which he said we must under-

Ambros.
lib. 5. de
Sacrament.
cap. 4.

De verbis
dom. secundum
Lucam.

hom. 28. et
lib. 2. de

Serm. de
in monte.
cap. 12.

cap. 12.

cap. 12.

cap. 12.

cap. 12.

cap. 12.

cap. 12.

A Rejoindre to

stande, and the recordes of that age touching the vse of the Communion, founde to be otherwise, then he beareth vs in hand: the seldom receiuing of the Sacrifice on the peoples parte, and the hauing of the Masse euery Sonneday considered, the Masse which he calleth priuate is founde and proued.

Iewel.

Concil.

Gerunde.

Ca. 1.

The. 165.

Vntruth.

The Coun

cel of Ge

run

da spe

ket

neuer

a worde

in

that canon

of the com

munion.

The. 166.

Vntruth.

I neuer

made any

such graue

And whereas M. Harding hath taken exception of smal townes and villages, vvhich he ghesseeth had then the priuate Masse, it vvas decreed and straitly ordered in a Council holden at Gerunda in Spaine, that al litle Churches in the countrie should conserue them selues vnto the great Cathedral Churches that vvere in Cities and Townes, * as vvel for order of the Communion, as also for singing, and other Ministracion.

But by M. Hardinges owne * graunt there vvas no priuate Masse then in Cathedral Churches: It foloweth therefore necessarily (this Council of Gerunda standing in force) that there vvas no priate Masse then in townes or villages.

Harding.

The Council of Gerunda is vntruly reported. It spaketh neuer a worde there of the Communion, but requireth an vniformitie of Masses, that whereas diuerse Masses were then written and set forth, one vniforme order of Masse for singing and doing the Ceremonies, should be kept through the prouince of Tarracon in Spaine, according to the custome obserued in the Metropolitan Church. If M. Jewel stand to y Council, he must needs subscribe to the Masse specially mentioned in the same, by the expresse name Masse, which he cannot finde in his harp: once to name, though it be expresse in the very place, which he allegeth. wherein he sheweth how partial he is, and with what vntruth he defendeth his cause, pretending the weapon to serue in his defence, wherewith he is stricken downe.

And

And as he falsifieth the Council of Gerunda, so he helpeth in alleging me, saying, that I graunt, the priuate Masse was not then in cathedral Churches, which I neuer graunted, albeit I acknowledge not the terme priuate in respect of the Sacrifice to apperteyne vnto the Masse.

And though the Council of Gerunda conteyned that he reporteth of it (which it doth not) yet could it not be drawn to helpe his cause, forasmuch as it was holden in a time much distant from the time of the council of Agatha, for to that age Jewell referreth al. And what if contrary order were in Spaine? Yet might it haue ben otherwise in Fraunce, whereof Agatha was a Citie. For how so euer it were in Spaine, if I proue Masse to haue ben donne without companie receiuing the Sacrament with the priest, in the Dioceses of the bishops that were assembled in Council at Agatha, I proue my purpose.

And that the people did then commonly receiue the Sacrament euery Sonneday, it appeareth by most certaine and vndoubted proues. The Council holden at Matiscona in Italie hath this Canon: Decernimus vt omnibus dominicis diebus altaris oblatio ab omnibus viris & mulieribus offeratur. VVe haue decreed that euery Sonday the oblation of the aulter be offred of al both men and women. Likewise the Council holden at Antisiodorum. Decernimus, vt vnaquique mulier, quando communicat, Dominicalem suam habeat. Quod si non habuerit, vsq; in alium diem Dominicum, non communicet. VVe decree that euery woman, when she doth communicate, haue her Dominical. If she haue it not, let her not communicate vntil the next Sonday. Likewise Carolus Magnus a long while after, among other his Ecclesiastical Lawes writteth thus: Vt populi oblationes Sacerdotibus in ecclesia offerant, & in die Dominico communicent. That the people offer their

the Council of Gerunda,

The Council of Gerunda, was long after the Council of Agatha.

The 167. Truth. This appeareth not by ought that here is brought to proue it. Council.

Matiscona. 2. ca. 4. Council. Antisiodorum. ca. 42.

Lib. 6. cap. 162. ex Cassandro.

A Reioindre to

Oblations vnto the priestes in the Church, and receiue the Communion vpon the Sonneday. By these Councils and Decrees it appeareth plainly without ghesse or Glose, that the people vsed commonly in al that time, and long after, to Communicate the holy mysteries euery Sonneday. Therefore M. Harding must yet seeke further for his priuate Masse.

Harding.

St. Iohn.
 pouerth a
 thing done
 in old time
 by a thing
 donne of
 later
 yeres.
 Then.

Remember what you promise, and what you haue to do. **St. Iewel.** You take in hande to proue, that the people did then commonly receiue the Sacrament euery Sonneday. Then say you. when was that then? In the time of the Council of Agatha: which was, farre within foure hundred yeres after Christe, for of that time speake we. Now you would proue it by the second Council of Carthage, by the Council of Antiochodorum, and by wordes fathered vpon Carolus Magne, which were long after the Council of Agatha. But you know if a thing be donne now, it can make no proufe it was so donne a hundred yeres past, no more then it foloweth that it rayned yesterday, because it rayneth to day. what a foolish reason is this? The Seruice of the Church in England was in English in the time of king Edward the sixth, Ergo, it was so in king Edwardes time the fourth? By no better nor wiser argument proue you, that the people then, that is to say in the time of Agatha Council, commonly receiued the Sacrament euery Sonneday.

But let vs examine your promises. First the Decree of the Council at Carthage maketh no mention of the Communion, but only of an Oblation, which al men and women were commaunded to make of bread and wine euery Sonneday. And because they brought their Offering to Church and laid it vpon the altar as the manner was, therof it was called Oblation of the

Oblation
 of the altar,
 made
 by layes
 folk what
 it was.

the aulter: Of such Oblations speaketh S. Gregorie, where he saith thus. Omnis Christianus procuret. &c. Let every Christian man prouide to offer vp vnto God somewhat at the Masse, and to bring vnto his remembrance, that God said by Moyses, thou shalt not appeare with empty handes in my sight. It appeareth plainly in the Collectes of the holy Fathers, that al Christian folke ought to offer vp vnto God somewhat after the custome of the holy Fathers. That this was such a tempozal Oblation it may be gathered by the circumstance of the wordes following in the Council of Mariscona. Vi per has immolationes & peccatorum suorum facibus careant, & cum Abel, vel ceteris iustis offerentibus promereantur esse consortes. That by these Oblations, they may both lacke the bandes of their synnes, and obtayne to be in fellowship with Abel, or with the others that righteously offered. But herof I haue sayd enough before in this very Division, where the same very wordes be alleged, as out of a Decree of S. Fabian. Mariscona, (to say this much by the way to deliuer the reader from errour) is not in Italis, as you wrote, but is a City in Fraunce (as you might haue learned of the bishops subscriptions) set vpon the ruer of Sone, one daies iourney from Lions, in French commonly called Mariscon. The Decree of the Council of Antisiodorum proueth nothing at al, that the people receiued the Sacrament every Sunday. I answer what you mean to allege it. Before you make an Argument against the Masse out of that Decree, it becometh you to serch diligently the Antiquities of the Ecclesiastical wyters: and when you haue learned what is meant by Dominicalis, yet shal you not thereby proue your purpose.

De Conf.
dist. 1. Omnis
Christianus
Exod. 23

Council.
Mariscon. 2
cap. 4.

Mariscona
a citie of
Fraunce,
not of Ita-
lia.

A Reioindre to

Those wordes, quando communicat, when she doth Communicate, do presuppose that she communicated not enery Sonneday. And forasmuch as if she had not her Dominical, she was kept from the Communion vntill an other Sonneday, it is an argument, that it was not so eise, as you pretend it was. For first it was lawfull for enery woman to forbear in this case, why may we not iudge the like of others?

If I would follow you, here could I reporte your slender argument, which a learned man would be ashamed of. And yet is it your owne, it is not forged. For thus you reason.

By the Councel of Antiochodorn, if a woman had not her Dominical, she might not Communicate vntill an other Sunday: Ergo, the people did Communicate with the worst enerye Sonneday.

Failetristation.

Then is vsque in diem Dominicum, to be Englished, vntill the next Sonneday, but vntill an other Sonneday, so that there might three or foure Sonnedayes come between without her Communicating the Decree notwithstanding.

*was this in
the same
place
to the
same*

As for the place of Carolus Magus, as it is pretended, it is of little force: for that your author, one of whom you allege it, (Cassander Aureus) is a man in this point of small credit, as your selfe are being enemye to the cause: and also for that being so mangled and cut from the body of his whole discourse, it is hard to iudge without conference of the booke, what thereby is meant. It may be thus construed, that, where as the people was wont to bring their Offeringes to the priestes home to their houses, or to other places: that from that time forward they should bring them vnto them in the Church. And that whereas they Communicated vpon other daies, and not vpon the Sonneday, he commanded them to Communicate vpon the Sonneday.

Thus

Thus it is cleare, that M. Jewel hath no substantiall ma-
ter against the Masse as he understandeth it to be private, but
only gheases and apmes. Therefore he must yet yeilde and
subscribe, if he be not lesse ashamed to breake his promise, then to
stand to his promise.

The xxxi. Division.

Furthermore I allege a Decree made in this Council of
Agatha, that permitted the Masse to be celebrated in pri-
vate Oratories, or Chapels at all times when there is not
a high feast, as that of Christs birth, the Epiphanie, Easter,
Ascension, &c. At which Feastes al were bounde to come to
their parishi Churches. Of this I gather, inasmuch as the
people did then vie to be houseled not commonly, but upon
the solempne Feastes, specially at the chief highest Feastes, as
by that Council it appeareth: that at other times in such places
Massettes were said sometimes, when no companye receyued
with the priest. Clerely where the peoples stature and vni-
deration was so great, that those Fathers thoughte it neces-
sary to binde them to communicate whyle in the vertue lead, as
though els they would not have done it at al, & so have Masse
every Sonneday notwithstanding: how wil it appeare likely
to any wise man, that in such private Chapels, to each of which
one onely familie resorted, the priest had upon every Sonneday
a sufficient companye to receive with him at his Masse? If he

Concil.
Agathen.
ca. 21.

Can. 18. &
Can. 43.

Can. 47.

had.

How man-
ny waies
Missa
may be ta-
ken after
the Jew-
els shiftig
deuise that
it be not
taken for
that in
dede it
signifieth.

had not, then he proceeded without them, and so farre is priuate Masse (as the Gospellers call it) proued. *He wel in his Replie to this, goeth not to the point directly, but as one diuinen to shittes, slateth vpon the woordes Missa. This worde he would faine haue to signifie, what so euer it were, so that it were not the Masse. At one time he handleth the mater so, that Missa must signifie a Communion: at an other time, an assemble of the people: at an other time, al manner of common prayers, or ordinary prayers: at an other time, Missa is neuer taken for the priuate Masse, saith he: at an other time, But let the vvorde Missa (saith he) be taken for the Masse (but this graunt is not worth God a mercy for by and by he addeth) that is to say, for the Ministracion of the Sacramentes. Such witties must be vsed, that defendeth a manifest vnttruth. So that now he is come to this point, that he accompteth it litle shame, to seeme impudent in saying, then duble in velding, now let vs see what pith, and what truth is in his Replie. Loth I am thus to spende my time, and so long to trille with a triller. Yet because he is taken of many a one that litle can iudge, for a greate Clecke: Let vs trie what substantial learning he bringeth for his purpose.*

seruel.

This worde Missa, in the olde writers sometimes signifieth no Masse, at al, neither Priuate nor Common: but onely a resorts and meeting of the people together in place and time of prayer, as it may sundry places appeare, and namely by Olde translations out of the Greeke into Latine touching the same. For that the Greeke writer differeth by the worde that signifieth an assemble or meeting of the people, the same doth the Latine Interpreter oftentimes translate by this worde Missa.

For

For example. Sozomenus in Greeke writeth thus: ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ λαοῦ, that is, when the people came together: that doth Epiphanius lib. 7 c. 5. translate into Latine thus: Cum populus congregaretur ad Missas, When the people came to Masse.

Epiphan.
in tripart.
hisor. lib.

Harding.

¶ Yet wil you nil you, Missa signifieth the Masse: And more I require not. I say not it signifieth the private Masse, nor the common Masse, but y^e Masse, what a doo make you about nonghe: Yet is euery Masse Common in respect of the Sacrifice in the same consecrated and offered, as I said in the beginning. But you say, the Masse is taken for an assemble of the people. And that would you proue if you could. To this purpose is one Epiphanius Scholasticus alleged, a man of simple autoritie God knoweth touching any doubt to be discussed with skil of y^e Breke and Latine tongue. He is to be commended for doing so well as he could, rather then to be folowed in translating Breke into Latine. Yet what hath he, whereby we should thinke, that Missa, signifieth an assemble of the people, and not the Masse? He hath turned ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ λαοῦ, thus in Latine: Cum populus congregaretur ad Missas: that is, as the people were together at Masse: For as you haue turned it, when the people came to Masse, it is neither the true translation of the Breke, nor of the Latine.

9. cap. 9.
Missa sig-
nifieth the
Masse.

Epiphani-
us Schola-
sticus
a traditor
of Sozo-
menus of
very
meane skill
Ex Sozo-
menus. lib.
7. cap. 5.
hist. trip.
lib. 9. c. 9.
False
translatio.

¶ Now because that Breke worde signifieth a committing to-
gether of the people to some solemne and publike businesse, and
nothing is done in Churches more solene then the diuine Ser-
uice, and of al the seruice the Masse is the chiefe: speaking of a
great miracle wrought by God in y^e Church named Anastasia at y^e
prayer of the people, to expresse so much as was in the Breke, he
thought good to turne the place as he did, Cum populus congre-
garetur ad Missas, As the people were assembled together in
the

A Reioindre to

the Church at Masse. which wordes at Masse are added for more plainesse, and for the better signification of so much as the Greeke worde implieth. So that if you thinke Epiphanius herein to be folowed, τὸν λαὸν ἐκκλησιαζέειν, shal signifie the people comming together at Masse or other Service, rather then Missa shal be taken simply for assemble of the people. And thus that place maketh for the antiquitie of the worde Missa, so farre as that Epiphanius is to be esteemed.

Ieruel.

Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 15. Likewise Socrates writeth thus in the grek, *καὶ ἐαυτοὺς ἐκκλησιαζέειν, that is to say, to haue a congregation, or assemble by them selues: *Epiphanius in Tripart. lib. 7. c. 31.* That doth Epiphanius translate into Latine thus: Apud se ipsos Missarum celebrare solennia; that is, Among them selues to celebrate the solemnities of the Masse.

But truth.
This is forged.
There is no such thing in that place of Socrates.

Harding.

Though al this were true, yet maketh this place no more for your purpose, then the other before. But Socrates in the booke and chapter by you quoted, hath no such wordes, nor speaketh of any such matter at al. And the place of Epiphanius translation onely giueth vs an other testimonie for the Masse: As false reckoning (they say) is no payment, so false allegation maketh no proufe of what so euer is in question. How be it I confesse τὸν λαὸν ἐκκλησιαζέειν, & συναχέειν τοὺς δούλους τοῦ κυρίου, are found oftentimes in the Ecclesiastical historiographers. which wordes how so euer they be turned into Latine, yet shal Missa kepe his olde signification; and be taken still for the Masse. Neither by that Greeke worde do we vnderstande what Missa signifieth, but rather by Epiphanius translation we are taught, what is meant by that Greeke worde.

Ieruel.

But let this vwards Missa, in the Decrees be taken for the Masse. that.

that is to say, * for the Ministration of the Sacramentes. Yet is not M. Harding much therefore the nearer to proue his purpose.

Harding.

This man is very free in his graunt. Let Missa (saith he) be taken for the Masse. but how? with a that is to say, for the Ministration of the Sacramentes. But Sir, the ministration of the Sacramentes being an other thing besides the Masse, as it is euident: what is your graunt, but this, Let Missa be taken for the Masse, that is to say, not for the Masse? And so by you, Missa, shalbe the Masse, & not the Masse, and consequently the Masse shal not be the Masse. Then because euery proposition that is true for the time to come, shal once be true for the time present, there shal a time be, when this proposition shal be true, the Masse is not the Masse, which is absurde, foolish and impossible. From this foolishnesse, you fall into crying out, Alas, vpon foolish argumentes of your owne forging, which you attribute vnto me, which you take to be a very fine Deuise, for els you would not vse it so often as you doo. From that gay sporte, you fall vnto manifest lying, where you say thus.

Levyl.

What was there no companie at al in the Chappel to Communicate with the Priest? * Verely it is provided by the Decree it self, that there should be a lawfull, and an ordinarie companie.

Harding.

At the Masse in such private Oratories or Chappels there was the familie of the house, which was licensed to haue the seruice there done. But that there was a sufficient companie ready to make vp a full Communio after the new deuise of our English Gospellers in each one familie, and that euery Sunday, which deuotion the Decree that bound the seculars to receiue this in the yeare at least, presupposeth to haue wanted in the people in general: this much you shal hardly perswade any wise man.

The 169.
vnto truth.
Masse is
gnified
not & M.
nistration
of the Sa
craments.

the Masse
is not the
Masse by
M. Jew.

The 170.
vnto truth.
There
was no
provision
made by
Decree
for a law
ful & ordi
nary com
pany to be
assembled
in chapels
abroad.
The new
Communi
ooke re
quireth
three de
voted the
which at
the least,

Q. Q. U

But

A Reioindre to

But where you say and anouch it with your oth *Verely*, that it was provided by the Decree it selfe, that there should be a laus-
ful and an ordinary companie: I say vnto you verely verely, that
concerning priuate Oratories and Chappels, wherof we speake,
it is a very false lye. Read the Decree who wil, so he shal finde
it. I denie not but it maketh mention of Legitimus ordinari-
usque conuentus, lausful and ordinarie assemble together: but
the Decree meaneth it of the parrish Churches. For thither did
the people resorte and assemble them selfe legitime and ordinarie,
as lawe and common order required. That the Maister of a
house had the Masse in his priuate Chappel at home, it was a
special priuilege besides the common lawe and order, propter fa-
tigationem familie, that is, in consideration of the families wea-
riness, if they should alwaies be compelled to go farre to their
parrish Churches. The words of y^e Decree (least any man should
thinke M^r. Jewel doth not deale so vntreuely) be these. Si quis
etiam extra Parochias, in quibus legitimus est ordinariusque con-
uentus, Oratorium in agro habere voluerit, &c. Also if any man
wil haue an Oratorie or chappel abroad in the countrie besides y^e
parrish Churches, in which the lawfull and ordinarie coming to-
gether (of the people to their diuine Seruice) is, &c. To what
other worde here can in quibus, in which, be referred, but onely
to Parochias? Therefore the Note put in the Margent of his
booke, In quibus est legitimus ordinariusque conuentus, is but a
doubling of his vntreuth. what may not a man defende, if such
manifest lyes may go for matter of good dooth?

Concil.

Agathen.

can. 21.

M^r. Jewel
falsifieth
the Coun-
cel of A-
gatha.

Replie.

Page 73.

Jewel.

And that in such companies; yea and in mens seruall houses they had the
Comunion ministred, it is euident by the preface of the Council of Gangra, a-
gainst the heretike Eustachius. These be the wordes. In domibus coniu-
gatorum ne orationes quidem debere celebrari persuaserunt, in tan-
tum.

ut, vt eas fieri vetet: & oblationibus quæ in domibus factæ fuerint, minime communicandum esse decernant. They haue perswaded the people, that prayers may not be made in married mens houses: and that so farre forth, that they forbid any such prayers to be made, and determine, that noman may communicate of the oblations made in houses. Here vve haue not onely the Communion, but also the ordinario vse of the Communion in priuate houses.

Harding.

By this place if the translation be admitted two things seeme to be proued, which I graunt both. *Mr. Jewel* denpeth one. That the Communion, that is to say the body of *Christe*, was geuen and receiued in priuate houses, I denie not. But that the body and bloud of *Christe* was also offered by vnto God, in priuate houses, or rather in the oratories of priuate houses, which in that Councils preface seemeth to be signified by the worde Oblations, wherby the Sacrifice of the Masse, and so the Masse it selfe is meant: This *Mr. Jewel* can not a way with, and therefore dissembleth, and speaketh of the Communion, which noman denied. But it had ben his parte to proue, that in priuat houses the Communion was alwaies receiued of a companie together with the Priest, and neuer of one alone. For the worde Communion helpeth not his opinion, because it is called a Communion, though it be receiued of one alone without other companie in the same place, as I haue before declared.

Now be it I thinke, the Fathers assembled at the Council of *Angra* meant not by these wordes the Communion, for prouise whereof they are here alleged by *Mr. Jewel*, but rather the sober and moderate feastes, w^{ch} at those daies Christian people kept, one bidding an other for brotherly loue and charitie, which of them were called *Agapæ*, which feastes as *Tertullian*

Of the ho
ly feastes
called
agapæ.

A Reioindre to

*Tertulli. in
Apologeti
co. cap. 39.
The man
ner and cu
stome of
breaking
bread at
the begyn
ning.
Act. 2. &
5.*

recoydeyth, they began and ended with prayers, and at them they offred and gaue gistes, partly to be spent forthwith at the feastes, partly to be distributed for reliefe of the poore brethren. This proceeded of a custome in the beginning of the Church. For the disciples vsed to assemble the faithful brethren together into priuare mens houses, teaching and preaching Christes firs house to house. There their manner was, to breake bread, and eate together, as thereof mention is made in the actes of the Apostles. In which places S. Chrysostome doth expounde panem frangere, to breake bread, to be as much as alimentum cum ieiunio & austeritate sumere, to take nourishment with abstinence and austeritie. And so we read in Oecumenius. Hoc autem, frangentes panem, dicit, ut frugalem & inelaboratum ostenderet ipsorum victum. Frangentes vero panem, sumebant alimoniam, non autem delicias. S. Luke (saith he) vitereth this worde, breaking bread, to shewe, with how smal and homely meat they liued. as they brake bread, they rooke but their foode, and not delicate dishes. This custome of coming together and of breaking bread, that is to say, of making cheere with reioysing and simplicitie of harte, continued many yerres in the primitive Church, as by the reports of this Council & of many Ecclesiastical histories it appeareth. After what sorte these holy feastes were kept, Tertullia in most goodly wise describeth.

*Tertulli. in
Apologet.
cap. 39.
How the
holy fea-
stes were
kept in
the primi-
tiue Church.
Agape.*

The name (saith he) of our feasting sheweth, what it is. It is called Agape, as much to say among the Grekes, as loue. How much so euer it coste, it is accompted gaine, so be at coste for godlinesse sake. For by this refreshing we helpe al that be poore. No vilenesse, no sawcinesse is committed. They sit not downe, before prayer vnto God be foretasted. They eate so much as hunger desyreth. They drinke so much as is good for chaste persons. They fil their bellies so as they that remeber, they must pray vnto God also in the night. They talke so, as they that knowe, God heareth

reth the. After that water for their handes, and lighte is brought in, echone is prouoked to sing somewhat vnto God among the, as he can out of the Scriptures, or of his owne head. Thereby it is tryed, how he dranke. Likewise prayer endeth the feast. Thence they departe, as they who haue made a feast not so much of meate, as of discipline. Thus, and much moze there, saith Tertullian.

S. Augustine speaking hereof saith thus. Agapæ nostræ pascunt pauperes, siue frugibus, siue carnibus. Our Churchfeastes do feede the poore, either with coyn, or with flesh. He answereth Faustus the heretike of the Manichees secte, who condemned the eating of flesh, and objected to the Christians, as though they had changed certaine Sacrifices of the Paynimes, in which they made a publike feast, into their Churchfeastes.

These holy feastes, wherewith Christian folke broughe and offered their portions according to their deuotion, partly to cherishe them selues after a most louing sort, and partly to refresh the poore and needy, which portions in this council are called *wpocphora*; that is, oblations, and the whole manner of the same, Eustarchius the heretike taught his followers to contemne and despise, if they were made in married mens houses; because he condemned marriage it selfe. And these scilicet wordes here alleged out of the Bishops epistle set before the Decrees of their Council, be as it were the argument of the eleventh Canon of the same Council, which in Canon hath thus according to the Greke. Si quis illos despicit, qui Agapæ in fide faciunt, & fratres inuitant in honorem Domini: neque velit his inuitationibus communicare, propterea quod vilipendat id quod agitur, Anathema esto. If any man despise those that make Churchfeastes as the faith requireth, and bid the brethré thereto in the honour of our lorde, and wil not be partaker of such biddings, for that he despiseth the thing that is donne, let him be accursed.

Contra
Faustum
Manichei
li. 20. c. 20

Oblationes.
The argu-
ment of
the eleventh
canon of
the Council
of Con-
stantinople.

ix πρὸς
ὡς ἀγὰ-
πας.

A Reioindre to

Thus right wel may this place of those fathers epistle be vnderstanded, so as it may seme to speake nothing at al of the Communion pretended to be in priuate mens houses. And so it maketh nothing for þ purpose, for which it is alleged. which wil better appeare to him that examineth the wordes, as they are vnterred in the Greke Original: from which the translation that M. Jewel vseth here, varieth not a litle.

One of
the here-
sies which
Eustathius
held. In
praesatione
Con-
cilij Gan-
gren.

The whole wil be the better perceiued, if it be considered, that Eustathius, against whom the Conncel of Gangra was holden, among other his heresies, helde, that the vse of flesh was ill, and that wedlocke was vnlawful. The Greke Original hath thus. Καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν (ἐνρίσκοντο) μεταλήψεις κρεῶν βδελυγνῶς μὲνοι. καὶ ἐν οἰκοῖς γάμμοις ὄντας ποιεῖσθαι μὴ βουλόμενοι, καὶ γινόμενων ἄλχων καταφρονούντες. καὶ πολλάκις προσφορῶν ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς οἰκίαις τῶν γάμμοις ὑπερφρονούντες. Atque ex istis nonnulli (cōperiebantur) qui sumere carnes eisq; vesci detestantur. Et qui nolunt in ædibus coniugatorū facere preces, factasque despiciunt: ac sæpe oblationes in illis coniugatorum domibus aspernantur. And of these certaine were sounde out, who abhorre to be partakers of flesh. And wil not make prayers in the houses of married persons, and despise such as be there made. And oftentimes set naught by the offerings in married folkes houses.

Thus is the place truly laid out before the good reader, which how litle it maketh either for the ordinarie vse of the Communion (for proufe whereof M. Jewel allegeth it) or for the Communion at al in priuate houses, thou mayst soone perceiue. For these offerings here mentioned were not the body and bloud of Christe vnder the formes of bread and wine consecrated and offered vp vnto God by a priest, of which bread and wine M. Jew.

Inte

furnisheth and chearseth the Communion that he speaketh of to have ben made : but other thinges by the Devotion of the faithful people geuen, to those charitable feastes, to the relieving of the poore, and to other godly uses by Tertullian expressed, to be employed.

Tertullian.
in Apolo-

Concerning the rest that M. Jewel saith in this Division, wherein he goeth about to proue that the people receiued the communion with the priestes, soasmuch as it is not denied: answer is needlesse. If he wil take vpon him to disproue the Masse, wherat the people is not disposed to receiue with the Priest, which he calleth priuate Masse: then his parte is to proue, that within the first vs. L. yeres there was neuer Masse celebrated, wherat the people did not receiue, or at least some other sufficient minister meete for a communion, which he himself alloweth for sufficient. which I am wel assured he shal neuer be habile to performe. And yet the examples & auctorities which here he bringeth out of the counsell of Agatha, Can. 60. and out of Siricius Decretal Epistle, Cap. 5. serue to proue, not that three or foure were alwaies ready to receiue with the priest, which new deuise serueth him oftentimes for a shifte: but that al the Christian people besides those that did open penance receiued with the Priest, which conuinceth the order of his owne new Communion. For in this our new primitive Church of England, where the gospel is hottest, & the blessed Sacrifice of the Masse most despised, it is wel known, that al their faithful brethren and sisters do not receiue as often as their Communion is ministered.

what hath
M. Jew.
to do, if he
take vpon
him to dis-
proue pri-
uate masse

And here is to be noted by the way, that whereas before M. Jewel refused the auctoritie of such Canons, as he put in by Gratian, & by him added vnto those 46. Canons, that Peter Cas found in his old writte copie: now he can be content to vse their auctoritie himself, because he imagineth the same to help his cause.

allegeth
now that
before he
condemned

Like

A Reioindre to

likewise here he allegeth the Decretal epistle of Pope Symon, whereas before he condemned al the Decretal Epistles in general. Thus in one place he condemneth for his pleasure what maketh against him, and in an other place, if it sounde any thing to his purpose through some false construction or colour cast vpon it, the same, as bring of good auctoritie, he alloweth and boldly allegeth. So now for a shifte he appealeth to the 60. Canon of the Councel of Agatha, and to the Epistle Decretal of Symon, which not farre before he condemned.

The xxxij. Division.

In this Division for proufe of Masse said without a companie receiuing the Communion with the Priest, I allege a story out of the life of the holy Patriarke of Alexandria Iohannes Eleemosynarius, Iohn the Almsgiue, writt in greke by Leontius bishop of Neapolis, a Citie in Cyprius. The story reporteth, that this Patriarke said Masse in his priuate Oratorie, hauing no other person with him that might receiue the Sacrament, but onely one of his seruantes, wherby priuate Masse is proued. For the circumstance of the story, I referre the reader to my booke.

Fol. 62. a

Eleemosynarius
writted by
Leontius
to auoide the
testimonie
of Leontius
con-
cerning pri-
uate masse

Because this mater is cleare, and can not be auoided, it is a worlde to see, how a Jewell starteth from one place to an other, and seeketh where to escape. First, he denieth the auctoritie of Leontius that wrote the story. Secondly, he pretendeth this Masse to haue ben said a fewe yeres without the compasse of his first six hundred yeres, and to diminish the estimation of it, he falsifieth

fiftieth Vincentius Bellanocensis, and maketh him to say, that
 the Masse was of the very age of Mahomet. Thirdly, he falsi-
 fieth certaine Decrees of Popes and Councels, saying them to
 forbid any man to say Masse in Chappel or private Oratorie.
 Fourthly, that this was no Masse, for there is no mention made
 of bread, and wine, Consecration, eleuation, aniter, bekinners, &c.
 Fifthly, with a scoffe he would make it doubtful, which of the
 three said this Masse, the bishop, the sernaunt, or the noble man.
 Sixthly, he fyndeth fault with my translation. Seventhly, he
 thinketh to escape, for that the Breke hath not the worde *Missa*,
 and because the interpreter was not a good Latine man.
 Eighthly, he saith, *Missa* is not that, which we call the Masse.
 Ninthly, he maketh it a strange case that I runne to Alexandria
 to seeke the private Masse. Tenthly, he pretendeth nowe, as
 though he demaunded it to be proued by S. Hierome, or S. Au-
 gustine, or by some other catholike Doctour. Last of al, as
 though none of al these shiftes would sufficiently serue the turne,
 he beareth vs in hand, that he demaunded prouise for the Masse
 said in open Church, in the face and sight of the people.

Now if I shewe al these to be but vaine escapes, and shiftes
 besides the truth, I trust they that be of God, and haue care of
 their soules, wil notwithstanding any thing in his Replie con-
 tained, esteeme the Masse as it ought to be esteemed, and beleue
 him as he deserueth. The chiefe places I wil lay forth, as he
 him selfe uttereth them, and the same confute, so briefly as I can,

Ieruel.

What is this Leontius that wrote this storie? Or who euer heard
 of his name before? I troyve he hath raised up one of the seven Sleepers
 to helpe him to Masse. He should haue shewed vs in his manner is,
 what this strange Doctour was, what bookes he wrote: where,
 when, in what age, and in what credite he liued. If he had said, this

A Reioindre to

Iohn the Almonar liued aboute sixe hundred yeres after Christ, and this Leontius, that wrote his life, a great while after that, this one circumstance would haue answered the matter wholly. &c.

Harding.

what if al this be shewed vnto you, and proued by good argument? Yet that that do you no good. For you are at a point not to subscribe and yelde, what so euer you promised: though our promises be neuer so euident. Not for your sake then, of whom I haue litle hope, but for their sakes, whom you and your companions with innumerable lyes haue dangerously seduced, I

Sh. I. c. 20.
demands
concerning
Leontius
be answered.

Of Leontius the
author of
this story,
and of his
works.

Concl.

Nicen. 2.

Athene. 4.

will here satisfie your demaundes.
This Leontius was bishop of Neapolis a Citie in Cypres, a holy and a learned man. He wrote diuerse workes, and among them one notable worke intituled, An Apologie for the Christians against the Iewes. which was brought by Pope Adrianus legates to the seventh general Councel holden at Nice in Bithynia.

And out of the fifth booke of the same Apologie, was read and openly pronounced by Stephanus Deacon and Notarie of that Councel, a very learned discourse against the Iewes touching Images: which after it was read and heard, Constantinus bishop of Constantia a Citie in Cypres, rose vp and said in audience of the Councel, as foloweth.

Pater hic, qui lectus est, in vna ex Ciuitatibus Cypri decenter & sancte conuersatus est, multaq; encomia & panegyricas illius orationes etiam habemus. Inter quas extat oratio in transfigurationem domini. Scripsit & Sancti Iohannis Misericordis appellati, Episcopi Alexandrini vita. Præterea beati Simeonis,urbationesq; propter Christum circa ea tempora in ecclesia factas. Scripsit & alia quedam, in quibus omnibus orthodoxus cognoscitur. Floruit circa tempora Mauricii Imperatoris. This father, which was now read, liued sanctely and holily in one of the Cities of Cypres.

And

And we haue many of his bookes and Orations made in praise of godly men or good thinges. Among which is extant his Oration, that he made vpon our Lordes Transfiguration. He wrote also the life of S. Iohn, named the Merciful, bishop of Alexandria. Furthermore the life of S. Simeones, and a storie of the troubles, that happened in the Church about that time. He wrote also certayne other thinges, and in them al he is knowne to be of the right beleefe. He liued about the time of Maxime the Emperour.

After this it foloweth in the 4. action of that Councel, Iohn the most deuout priest of God, Vicar of the See Apostolike of the East, said: Clarum est. &c. It is cleare, that al thinges be true which haue here ben said in praise of the foresaid father. And more ouer the Legates of the most holy Pope haue exhibited this booke vnto the Councel. &c.

Thus be your Demaundes answered touching the auctoritie of Leontius. Mention is made of this Father also by Iacobus Philippus Bergomensis in supplemento. who saith of this blessed man Iohn the Almsgiuer, that with his Sermons and learned Epistles he renoued from heresie the whole Church of the East. And whereas it is here reported, that Leontius liued about the time of Maxime the Emperour, in whose time S. Gregory was Pope: therof it appeareth by this bishop I. Iohn the Merciful or Almsgiuer, said Maister either before your Sirshipdeth yere was expired, or very soone after. And though it were a yere or two after, the matter is of as good credite, as it could be proved to haue ben done a yere or two before. Unless you can shew us credibly, that Christe forsooke his Church, and brake promise concerning his continual remaining with her vntil the worldes ende, suddenly and inuice at the very last houre. and inuice of the foresaid yere, which to think as it is most blasphemous, so no less absurd.

W. I.

Yours

The time
and age of
Leontius.

A Reioindre to

Your selfe partly do graunt, as it appeareth by your note in the margent, that this holy bishop John began to be in estimation in the yere of our Lorde. 610. Then it standeth with good reason, that he exercised a vertuous life, and vsed to doo notable dedes before that time. For so notable a fame as he was growne unto, is not achieved in short space, but with long continuance. And so it is not to be doubted, but he might in like sort haue said Masse without any others receiuing the Sacrament with him, before the last day of the six hundredth yere was past. O M. Jewel, that you are not ashamed thus to claime aduantage of so smal a time. Doth not this bewray the vnt ruth of your cause? If it were vnlawful to celebrate the Masse without a companie of Communicantes in the same place ten yeres before the six hundredth yere, could it be lawfull ten yeres after? If it were vnlawful, and contrary to the Institution of Christ, as you say, and proue it not: shal we thinke so holy and so learned a bishop would haue donne it? and that so graue and so learned a man as Leontius was, would to his praise haue made mention of it?

Vincentius
in specul.

li. 23. ca. 17

The. 171.

Vntruth.

Vincentius

us doth

not so

write, and

mahomet

first spred

his religi-

on after-

ward in

the later

time of

the Em-

perour.

Jewel.

Vincentius in his booke that he calleth Speculum, vergeth thus.

After Gregorie was dead, Bonifacius ruled the Church of Rome.

This Bonifacius obtained of the Emperour Phocas, that the

Church of Rome should be the head of al Churches, and that be-

cause the Church of Constantinople vvrote it selfe by that rule. The next

yere after that, Augustine that vvas called the English mens Bishop, died.

The yere folowing Iohn the Almonar vvas in great fame, at vvhich time

also *Mahomet first spred his religion in Arabia.

Harding.

Now is Vincentius a good Doctour with you, and a man

worthy to be brought in for witness.

In your very next Di-

uision

mission he is but a fabler and a man of no reputation. **Dr. Do-**
cour Cole alleged men of a farre more excellencie as touching
 learning, then euer this Vincentius was, yet because they plea-
 sed not your humour, it liked you to cal them the blacke garde.
 And thus sometimes al is fish that cometh to the net with you,
 sometimes you cast away: hat is right good.

Touching that you haue here alleged, out of Speculum Hi-
 storiale Vincentij, I knowe not what I should note, but your
 great and notorious falsifyinges. As for your false quotation,
 I could sore heare with you, so it be not affected of euil purpose.
 The place is not In Speculo, lib. 23. cap. 17. as your booke hath,
 but, lib. 22. cap. 107. Concerning the mater, After S. Gregorie
 was dead, Vincentius telleth you, that Sabinius was next
 made Pope: And after him Bonifacius. And speaking of S.
 Augustine the Apostle of our nation, whom you haue rashly and
 wickedly condemned: for a proud and otherwise an euil man, he
 saith not, Augustine, that was called the English mens Bishop,
 as you haue falsified his wordes: but, Augustinus primus An-
 glorum Episcopus, Augustine the first Bishop of the English.
 Because you can not brooke y^e saith which that blessed man plan-
 ted first in our countrie, which is contrary to your new denised
 Gospel, therefore you would rather play a false parte in chaun-
 ging your Doctors wordes, then seme to your owne brethren
 before whome you haue so much railed at him, to laye forth
 plainly what is said to his commendation.

These false partes of yours be very bad, and vnseemly
 for one that taketh vpon him the roome of a Superintendent, and
 of a preacher of Gods worde: but that which soloweth is
 much worse. For whereas Vincentius saith in praise of the
 holy man S. John the bishop of Alexandria thus, qui ob eximi-
 am in Christum liberalitatē nomē Eleemosynarij habere meruit,

that

that

Vincenti-
 us liked a
 mistike of
 Dr. Jew:
 as he ma-
 keth with
 him, or a-
 gaist him.
 Dr. Jew.
 in his Re-
 plie to
 Dr. Cole.
 Vincenti-
 us falsifi-
 ed by Dr.
 Jewel.

Article. 3.
 Pag. 185.
 Augustin
 the first
 bishop of
 the Eng-
 lish.

A Reioindre to

It is to say, wdo for his exceeding great liberalitie towards Christ
deserved or was accepted worthy to haue the name of merciful, or
almosegeuer: you suppress those wordes of his praise, & in steede of
the placed these in your falsified translation at which time Mahomet
first spread his Religion in Arabia. which wordes you haue caused to be
printed with the distinct letter of your Doctors allegations, that
they might so seme to be the wordes of Vincentius. It semeth
you were loth to venter any such good wordes in commendation of
that holy Father, least by the same the more aueritie & estimation
on might grow to the Masse, which he said in his oratorie with
out a company receiuing the Communion with him.

The anti-
quitie of
the masse.
Luc. 22.

And whereas you say by the way, that this story, which you
call a tale, proueth the Masse to be of the very age of Mahomet:
you might better so haue said; if you had ben a Mahometane.

The. 172.
Untruth,
Damascius
saith not
so, as here
thou must
see.

Touching the Antiquitie of the Masse, it is so auncient, as the
last Supper of our Lord is. For touching the essential partes of
it, it was instituted by Christ, and commanded so be continued
in remembrance of his death vntil he come.

25. q. 1. Vio-
latores.

level.
But to leane both the advantage of the time, and also the exception against
the Author, let vs consider the likelihoode of the doing: and if Iohn the Al-

The. 173.
Untruth.
Soters
decree is
not so ge-
neral. It
is limited.

monar said this priuate Masse in his chappel, how safely he might so doo by
the order of the holy Canons, which to breake *Damascius saith, is blasphemie
against the holy gospe. M. Hardinges Leontius saith, Iohn the Almo-
nar said Masse in his Oratorie at home, being sure of no more companie but
of one of his owne household seruantes alone. But Pope Soter, as it is before

The. 174.
Untruth.
that con-
cel saith
not so.

alleged by M. Harding. straitly commaundeth that no priest presume to ce-
lebrate the Sacrament without the companie of two together. And againe
that no priest dare to minister, without the companie of some other priest.

It saith
domibus,
and not at
home,

And in the Councel holden at Orleance it is decreed thus. It is lawfull
for euery Christian man to haue a chappel in his house: but to haue
Masse said there it is not lawfull. And in the Councel holden at Laodicea,
it is not lawfull for Bishops or Priestes to minister the oblations *at home.

Like.

Likevvise Pope Felix, It is not lawfull to minister the Communion at home, but vpo exceeding great necessitie. The same order vvas taken in the Council of Acon, and in sundry other Councils. Vvhich Decrees being so many, and so strait, it is not likely that Iohn the Almonar being so holy a man, wil wilfully breake them al vvithout cause.

Harding.

Here M. Jewell iumbleth together a meany of Councils and Popes Decrees for some shewe of learning, and him selfe esteemeth them no whit at al. Yet that it may appeare, how vntuly he allegeth them, and how he contineweth his common practise of falsifying his allegations, & how litle al this maketh for him: I require thee good Reader, if thou be learned, to do nomore but onely reade, what these Decrees do reporte. If thou be not learned, in case thou wilt beleue the truth, thus it is.

First, Damasus saith not simply that to breake the Canons, is blasphemie against the holy ghost. But thus he saith, Blasphemia in Spiritum sanctum non incongrue videntur, qui contra Sacros Canones non necessitate compulsi, sed libenter aliquid aut proterue agunt, aut loqui presumunt. They, & either doo ought, or presume to speake against the holy Canons, not compelled by necessitie, but gladly of their owne wil, and of a frowardnesse, not without reason seme to utter blasphemie against the holy Ghost. Thus is the Decree of Damasus otherwise qualified, then M. Jewell reporteth. Neither is it spoken besides reason, that presupposed which Damasus in the same Decree layeth as it were for the grounde of the same. which is, that the Canons were made and pronounced, by the instinct and gitte of the holy Ghost.

Touching the two Decrees of S. Soter the Pope, that no Priest presume to celebrate Masse without the presence of two, who might coueniently make answer vnto his salutations: and

The. 179.
vntuly.
Felix spea
keth
neither of
ministering
the Com
munion,
nor of
home.

The. 176.
vntuly.

This
Council
spea
keth
not agai
st
saying

Mass: as
home, but
forbideth
it to be do
in uncon
secrated &
profane
houses.

Damas.
falsified
by M. Je
well.

25. q. 1. Vis
latores.

Chine in
simctu
dono dict
ti sunt.

SS. I. againe,

A Reioindre to.

De cons.
dist. 1. hoc
quoque.
In argu-
mento in
Concilio
Gangren.
A notable
saying of
S. Grego-
rie tou-
ching the
Canons
of the Fa-
thers.

De cons.
dist. 1. mi-
nime.

De cons.
dist. 1. Cle-
ricos ex se-
nta syno-
do.

again, that the Priest be assisted with an other Priest for to sup-
plie his roome in case of suddaine infirmitie: hereto we say that,
which in this case S. Gregorie said, as it is alleged by Gratian;
Regulæ Sanctorum Patrum, pro tempore, loco, & persona, & ne-
gotio, instante necessitate, tradite sunt. The Canons or rules of
the holy Fathers haue ben geuen for, according to þ time, place
person, and businesse, when present necessitie so required. Ther-
fore they bynde not in like sorte al persons, at al times, in eue-
ry place, neither pertaineth their strait obseruation of necessitie
in respect of euery circumstance, to al cases. So the holy Patriarke
John did not wilfully breake, as you say, that order, wherewith
of necessitie he was not bounde. Besides this, in his age, those
two Decrees of S. Soter were growen out of vse, as since
that time many others haue.

As for that you bring out of Gratian, as alleged out of a Cel-
cel holden at Orlance, what maketh it to your purpose? By that
Council it was lawfull for euery man to haue an Oratorie in his
house, and there to pray, but not to celebrate Masse, for so be the
wordes, and not, to haue Masse said as you haue translated þ De-
cree, what concluded you of this? It was not lawfull for euery
man to celebrate Masse in an Oratorie at home, Ergo, was it not
lawfull for the Patriarke of Alexandria to say Masse in his Orato-
rie? what reason haue you in this? It is not lawfull for euery man
to preach: shal we inferre thereof, Ergo, it is not lawfull for any
Priest to preach: where you founde this in Gratian, immediat-
ly in the next line you founde this, Clericos qui ministrant in ora-
torijs, quæ intra domos sunt, cum consensu Episcopi loci, hoc facere
precipimus. The clerkes which do minister in Oratories, that
be within houses, we commaunde the so to do with þ consent of þ
Bishop of the place. So here you saw, þ with consent of þ Bishop,
a Priest might say Masse in an Oratorie. Knowing this, you
would not haue alleged þ other Decree of Orlance to proue this
holp.

holy Patriarke a breake of the holy Decrees and Canons, except you had be disposed to set a side al sinceritie in your dealing. If it were lausful for any private person with leaue to say Masse in an Oratorie that is within a mans house, it is sone conceived how farre that great Patriarke was from breach of lawe and order in that behalfe. Againe that Councel being Provincial could not binde the Patriarke of Alexandria.

The Councel of Laodicea is here falsified. It hath, that Oblations ought not to be made by Bishops or Priestes in domibus, in houses, which Decree proueth no breach of order in this holy Father. For whereas this Councel by houses, meaneth Commons and prophane houses, this Father offendeth not against it, as he that said Masse, not in such a house, but in his chappel or Oratorie appointed and consecrated to holy uses, and to Divine Service. That this Decree is so to be understood, we are taught by the Epistle which Pope Felix the fourth wrote to al Bishops.

As you haue falsified al the other Decrees mentioned before in this Division, so now you falsifie the Decree of Pope Felix, which you make to say thus. It is not lausful to minister the Communion at home, but vpon exceeding great necessitie. But the Decree speaketh not of ministering the Communion, nor of home, but farre otherwise. The wordes be these, as they be laid together by Gratian, which be in the epistle of Felix, though some other wordes comming betwene. Sicut non alij, &c. As none others ought to celebrate Masse but Priestes that are consecrated vnto God, nor offer Sacrifices vpon the altare: so neither is it lausful to sing Masse, or to offer Sacrifices in other places, then in those which be consecrated to our Lorde, that is to say, in tabernacles appointed by Bishops with holy prayers, except very great necessitie enforce otherwise. After these wordes it foloweth there immediately: Satis est ergo Missam non cantare, aut non audire quam in istis locis ubi fieri non oportet, nisi pro summa necessitate contingat.

SS U Ig

Conc. Laodicea. c. 38

The Cossell of Laodicea falsified by the Jewes false translation of at home, for in

domibus in houses.

Cap. 1. in fine tom. 2

Concilio

The Decree of Felix falsified by the Jewes.

In epistola

Felici

quarti ad

ves episc.

cap. 1.

De cons.

dist. 1. Sicut non alij.

A Reioindre to

Mark reader, here hast thou the phrase audire Missas, to heare Masse, which M. Jew. saith to be sonde and straunge. Replie page. 70. How litle the Council of Acon maketh for M. Jewels Concil.

Aquisgramen. c. 84.

It is better therefore not to sing Masse, or to heare Masse at al, then to haue it donne in such places, where it may not be donne, but vpon a very great necessitie, which place I allege the rather, that thou mayst vnderstand Reader, that to say, I wil heare Masse, is not a straunge and fond saying, as M. Jew. saith it is, and for which he hath made so much a doo: but such as hath of learned men ben bled of olde time.

Concerning the Council of Acon, what so euer was there decreed, it could not bynde this holy Patriarke of Alexandria, both for that it was Provinciall and not general, and also for that it was holden two hundred yeres after his death, in the time of Andronicus the first, Emperour, in the yere of our lord eight hundred sixteen. And yet p. 84. Canō of that Synode is the. 58. Canō of the Council of Laodicea, which as I haue now declared out of the epistle of Pope Felix the fourth, forbiddeth Bishops and Priests to offer vp the oblations in houses, that is to say, in prophane dwelling places not consecrated to gods Service by p. consecration of a Bishop. Thus be al your Decrees and Councils easily wiped away M. Jewel, which you haue here heaped together, to make your vnlearned reader thinke, that S. Iohn the Almsgiueur could not, ne ought not say Masse in his chappel or Oratorie. Now must you seeke better stuffe, for this is litle worth. Let vs see what substance is in that which foloweth in your Replie.

Ieruel.

Neither in dede if M. Harding wil thoroughly beholde the mater, shal he finde here any Masse spoken of at al, neither bread, nor wine, nor Consecration, nor Oblation, nor Elevation, nor Aulter, nor vestiment, nor any other thing to the Masse belonging.

Harding.

In dede who so euer wil thoroughly beholde your Demeanour,

nour, shal see no truth in you, but altogether mocking and lying. What say you? Is not the Masse here spoken of at al? Did you not read the place, when you wrote this slender peece of your Replie? Haue you not these words *Facit Missas in Oratorio suo*, He saith Masse in his Oratorie? Can not we vnderstand there was a Masse, except Consecration, Oblation, and Perception, wherof chiefly it consisteth, and what so ener els pertaineth to the Masse, as bread, wine, aulter, vestimentes, and other thinges be expressely mentioned?

Shal one that speaketh of *M. John Jewel* by name, not be beleued, except he speake after this sorte, He that in *Queene Maries* time subscribed at Oxford in a solemne assemblie of learned men to the Masse, to the real presence, to the Sacrifice propitiatorie, and to other pointes of the Catholique doctrine, and now is a great impugner of the Church, and of the Catholique faith, an usurper of the See of Sarisburie, he that made that insolent and foolish Challenge to al Learned men in the world, and set it forth in print, he is thought of his owne brethren therein to haue said more then he is able to insistie, he is now of late hath sent abroad a huge booke stuffed with mo lies then Paragrapshes intituled *A Replie*, &c. Except, I say, he frame his tale after this sorte, shal he not be thought to speake of *M. Jewel*? I thinke verely your selfe wil confesse, is to require him to vtter so much, for credite sake in that behalfe were very absurde. Euen so may it be said here, what neede was it to speake of his partes of the Masse, of Bread and wine, aulter and vestimentes, where the Masse it selfe is expressely named? Now what haue you next to say?

Jewel.

And if vve agree there vvas Masse said there, yet may there growe an other doubt, vyhich of these thre said Masse, I meane the Bishop, or the Gentle man, or the Seruant.

S. ij

Harding.

A Reioindre to

Harding.

I perceiue our M^r. Iohn of Sarisburie would faine play Dicke Scopner, if he had a mery parte, for it seemeth he hath on him a fooles cote already. But Syr I pray you, keepe your spoote in stoze until an other time, and perhaps if you play the Wise wel and varletlike, you may chaunce to make a good company laugh their bellies full.

Ieruel.

The. 177. vntreuth.

My translation is true as here I proue it.

The. 178. vntreuth.

There be no such wordes in al this diuision.

The. 179. vntreuth.

It is manifestly implied though not in precise wordes of Sacrament & Consecration expessed

The. 180. vntreuth.

This can not be said of mee in this place, but altogether of M^r. Ieruel

for he collecth thinges, & be not here, as though they were here.

But he vvil replie, here is the very name of the Masse: *Ecce facit Missas.* And to make the more appearance, M^r. Harding

helpeth it forth vwith a preaty * false translation of his owne.

For vvhether it is vwritten in the Latine, *Cum benedixisset sancta*, he translateth it thus. Vhen he had consecrated the

Sacrament: * And likewise these vwoordes, *Post finem Orationum*, he translateth thus, after he had done the prai-

er of Consecration: not vwithstanding he knowv right vvel

that in these vwoordes there is no * mention at al, neither of

any Sacrament, nor of any Consecration.

And thus * *Vocat ea quae non sunt, tanq^u sint*, He cal-

leth thinges that be not, as though they were: and yet is not

afraid of *Lex Cornelia de falsis*. But this I troyv he him-

self vvil confesse, is no sincere nor plaine dealing.

Harding.

Yea Syr here is the name of the Masse in dede, that you abhorre so much. how can you auoide it? what phrase haue you

to colour the matter, that the Masse shal not signifie the Masse?

And though Leontius wrote in Breke, and therefore vbled not the

Latine worde *Missas*, yet the circumstance of the place geueth it to

be the Masse. I helpe it forth say you, with a preaty false transla-

tion of myne owne. why finde you fault with my translation good

Syr? *Cum benedixisset sancta*, I haue translated thus: when he

had consecrated the Sacrament, In which worde finde you the

fault?

This is
but piglig
of a quarrel

saule? In the translation of Benedicere, or of Sancta? If Benedicere be to Consecrate, and if the blessed Sacrament, or rather the thing of the Sacrament, which is the body and blood of Christ, be called Sancta: then do you but make a quarrel, and finde saule where none is.

Verely the aunient Fathers do commonly vse the word of Benediction or blessing either for the Consecration or for the thing consecrated. S. Ambrose so taketh it, where he saith, Ipse clamat Dominus Iesus: hoc est corpus meum. Ante benedictionem verborum coelestium, alia species nominatur, post Consecrationem Corpus Christi significatur. Our Lord Iesus him self cryeth, This is my Body. Before the blessing of the heavenly words, it is named an other kinde, after the Consecration it is signified to be the Body of Christ. Lo, what in the fore parte of his saying he calleth benediction or blessing, the same immediatly in the latter parte he calleth Consecration, wherby he sheweth by both words one self thing to be signified, which al do terme Consecratio.

Cum benedictionem dico, Eucharistiam dico, when I say blessing, I meane the Eucharist, saith S. Chrysostome. who so ever is conuersant in the workes of Cyrillus, he can not be ignorant, how that learned Father in infinite places calleth this blessed Sacrament, benedictionem Mysticam, the Mystical blessing. So do the Fathers of the first Ephesine Council. And some Doctours haue expounded the worde benedicere, by consecrare, where S. Baile saith, Calix benedictionis cui benedicimus, &c. Cui benedicimus, id est, quem nos Sacerdotes Consecramus: The cup which we blesse, that is, which we consecrate, saith Baile, and also S. Thomas. what the Latines signifie by consecrare, the same do the Greekes expresse by εὐλοῖν, which is to blesse.

Now if you denye the holy and dreadfull Mysteries, to

SS in

Witte.

That this
worde
Benedi-
cere, is
taken for
Conse-
crare in
the for-
thers.
Deijs qui
iniciantur
Mysterijs.
cap. 9.
Mat. 26.

Chrysost.
in 1. Cor.
10. ben. 24.

S. Thomas
in 1. Cor.
10. lect. 42.

A Reioindre to

The thig of the Sacrament is called
 τὰ ἅγια, Sancta.
 sanctum Domini.
 Cyprian.
 In serm.
 de lapsis.
 In Liturgij Graecorum.
 Nicol. Ca-
 basila in
 expositio-
 ne Litur-
 gia c. 30.
 Fol. 26. a.
 M. Icw.
 burthe-
 neeth me
 that is not
 in this di-
 uision to
 be founde.
 what wil
 he spare to
 say, when
 he findeth
 a fault,
 spetting
 such be-
 nigne, whe
 none is
 conuicted.
 Rom. 4.

witte, the body and and blond of Christe, to be commonly called
 τὰ ἅγια, or τὰ ἁγια μύσθη in greke, sancta, and sometimes sanctum
 Domini, in Latine, the holy thinges, or the holy thing of our
 Lorde: you shew your selfe either very cōtentious and scoward
 in denyng so manifest and knowen a truth, or very ignozant
 both of the auncient Colicels, and also of the Fathers writings,
 what was meant but the blessed Sacrament, when the Deacons
 cryed out aloude in the Greeke Churches, ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, Sancta
 sanctis, holy thinges for the holy?

But Syr what meant you to charge me in this Diuision,
 with translation of the other place which you note? Likewise (say
 you) these vvordes, Post finem orationum, be translateth thus, after he
 had done the prayer of Consecration. Where so euer it is so translated,
 it may wel be allowed. But what? wil you burthen me here
 with y translation? Doth y helpe forth the mater here? Gentle
 Reader, I pray the cōsider, how falsly M. Jewel demeaneth him
 selfe. Read my wordes, either in myne owne booke, or as they
 be laid forth in his Replye. These wordes, Post finem oratio-
 num, thou findest not at al in al this. xxxij. Diuision. If they be
 not here, why repproueth he me for vsing a preatie false translation?
 This is not a pteary, but a very grosse and shamelesse kinde of
 falsched, to charge me with that which here I say not. And yet
 O Lorde, of what bitter gaul he voideth his stomack against me.
 This peece of Scripture, he calleth thinges that be not, as though they
 were, is miserably wrested against me: Lex Cornelia de falsis,
 is thundered out vpon me. And I my selfe must confesse, this is
 no sintere nor plaine dealing. The Margent also lacketh not a
 testimonie of his spite, where he hath caused this note to be put
 in light. M. Harding corrupteth and falsifieth his translation.

God be thanked, I am not much troubled with the stinge
 of such waspes. It is an euident token that he lacketh good
 mater,

matter, rich he forgeth to open eyes against me. But where this matter shal come to examination of me that loue the truth, what shal he winne by such false and impudent dealing; but present discredit of his cause? Fight no more. Jewel with your owne shadow. The poison of your singe can not enter into me. Your blame is a false slander. The fault whereof you twise me, is not here by me committed. Your abused scripture I resourne ouer vnto you againe. Beware least the time come, when lex Cornelia de falsis, shal be exercised vpon you.

Touching the translation of these wordes, Post sinem orationum, that is, After he had donne the prayers of Consecration: this being granted and acknowledged, that in the place mention is made of the Masse: I affirme the translation to be good. For the author that so wryteth, understandeth by Orationes, the prayers pronounced about the Consecration, or the very wordes of Consecration. For so the best learned & auncient Fathers haue spoken. For good prouofe herof I referre you to that learned Epistle, which S. Augustine wrote vnto Paulinus, who speaking expressly of the distinct kindes of prayers, there saith thus, Precationes accipimus dicimus, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud quod est in Domini mensa incipiat benedici. Orationes autem benedicuntur & sanctificantur &c. We take Precationes to be called those prayers, which we make in the celebration of the Sacraments, before that, which is on our lordes table, begin to be blessed: and Orationes (we take for the prayers that he said) when that (which is on our Lordes table) is blessed and sanctified or consecrated. Marke you well also those wordes following therein as pertaining to this purpose. Excepto nomine generali orationis, capite prois intelligenda est oratio, quam facimus ad votum, id est propter obsequium. Videntur autem omnia que offeruntur Deo, maxime sancti altaris Oblatio, &c.

Iustification of my Translation. Col. 28. 2.

this word Orationes is taken for the wordes of Consecration.

Aug. ep. 15.

Aug. ep. 15. Orationes sunt preces que fiunt in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud quod est in Domini mensa incipiat benedici.

A Reioindre to

Preces. *Hieron. ad* *Euagriū.* As *S. Augustine* calleth the prayers of Consecration orationes, so *S. Hierome* calleth them Preces, meaning one selfe thing, whose wordes these be in his Epistle to *Euagrius*. Quid patitur mensarum minister, vt super eos se tumidus effecit, ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisq; consecratur: what saith the minister of tables (wherby he meaneth a Deacon) to swell and aduance him selfe ouer them, at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ is Consecrated? And he calleth the wordes of Consecration, prayers. *S. Iustine* the blessed martyr calleth the same so likewise, wher he mentioneth, τὰς εἰς αὐτοῦ ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸν αἵμα καὶ τὸν σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the loode which is made the Eucharist through the prayer of the worde that the haue of him; that is to say of Christ.

In Iurgie *expofitio.* *In lib. de* *sacramēto* *Euchari-* *stia.* Soasmuch then as the wordes of Consecration, wherewith the body and blood of Christ be Consecrated, are of these ancient Fathers called prayers, as also oftentimes of *Nicolaus Cabasila*, and *Bellarion*: my translation of the forementioned wordes, Post finem Orationum, after he had done the prayers of Consecration, specially the Masse in the same place being spoken of, and the whole circumstance necessarily reding that sense, was not to be reprehended, but to be admitted for right & good. Neither should the same haue offended you, but that it made for the better prouide of the Masse.

The. 181. *Untruth.* *It is not* *yet moued* *as now it* *appeareth.* *The. 182.* *Untruth.* *No such* *thing ap-* *peareth in* *the two* *Councils* *of Carthage*

Terrel. *Missal in this place importeth not the Masse.* For we haue already proued by sundrie authorities, *Missal* is oftentimes vsed for any kinde of prayer. As it may further appeare by *anaphora* of *Chromatius* and *Isidorus* sent into *S. Hierome* touching *Gorgonius* the bishop of *Carthage*, and by the wordes of the *Council of Carthage*. Which thing also very well agreeth with the custome and order of the Church of *Alexandria* at that time, wherof *Nicephorus* writeth thus. Quarta hebdomadis die, & c. quæ *Parasceue* dicitur, *Alexandrin* Scripturas legebant, Docto- ri-

A Rejoindre to

There haue we also, that Churken people do heare Masse,
which pharse, M. Jewel condemneth bitter. Audiant Missas,
they heare Masse, is twise founde. Cap. 19.

Thiſpſa
le to heare
Maſſe, is
biſep of the
conncel of
Challon.
L. Sr quis.
C. d. 1st.

Now y^e you alleged the Council of Chalons for you, though to no purpose, we may reasonably require you to admit the auctoritie of it making against you; and that to good purpose. You that are so great a Lawyer, or at least that use the helpe of a lawyer so commonly, remember what the lawe saith, I doubt not.

Si quis testibus visus fuerit, ijdemque testes aduersus eum in alia
lite producantur: non licebit eis personas eorum excipere. If a ma-
ble witnesses, and the witnesses be brought against him in an o-
ther cause: it shal not be lawfull for him to take exception against
these persons. when you shal proue by the Countel of Challon,
that Masse is not taken for the Masse, but for any kinde of pray-
er, you shal proue vs reasonable. In the meane time we require
you, that you appeale to that Countel, to yeilde and subscribe
vnto the Masse, vnto Articulas or secret Confession, and vnto
Masses and prayers to be donne and said for the faithful soules
departed, vnto the terms and phrase of hearing Masse. For ad-
dresse points of catholic Religion be in the Countel of Challon
most manifestly anonched. And what if Masse were taken some-
times for any kinde of prayer, as you would haue it, wold it there-
fore follow, that it is contrary to Constat?

But if y^e would name the Chapter Solent place, which you
allege, to be a parte of the Countie of Shalton, for Douglas sake,
who reporteth it as out of that Countie, what conclude you then
of? How please you thereby that Masse is taken for any kinde of
playe? Whye then say you, there be no mention of Masse to
be celebrated in y^e Gentiles of the tower church (which we call Jhr-
ter church) nor in Shalton, & in the very same day, which is the
first of Nov, given us for initiation, adding the beginning of the high:

2042

Why say you thinke you that Masse is taken for any kinde of prayer, because in that place it is required to be donne in the Evening, as though the Masse might not at any time be celebrated but only before noone? If you so thinke, you are deceived.

For in old time it was not only lawfull, but also commaunded, that Masse should be said at after noone. vpon certain daies, That was, when the fast of the foure times was kept, and vpon Easter eue, which fastes were at that time much more straitly kepte, then now they be. And this was donne because none then might take his refection and eate, vntill the Oblation was offered, and Masse donne. Now the time of refection vpon fasting dayes, was at the ninth houre, accompted made from the risinge of the Sunne, as we reade in S. Augustine in his Epistle to Iannarius. On Easter eue Masse was celebrated about the beginning of the night, that afterward the people might take their refection. which beginning of that night was accompted to apperteyne to Easter day, as a parte of the same, for so we learne of Irenaeus writing to Diolcorus.

And that Masse was celebrated both in the morning, or at least before dinner, & also at the Evening vpon Maundy Thursday, we haue it clearly witnessed by S. Augustine in the said Epistle to Iannarius. The forenoone Oblation (by which wordes in that place the Masse is signified) was for them that being awake could not faste, both to faste, and, as the manner then was, to be washed. The Evening Oblation of Masse was for them that were stronger and kept their faste. wherfore that Masse was celebrated at night, or in the Evening at certain times, it maketh no argument at all that it is taken in the Command of Catholique, or in the Canon Solent places, (whoso so euer it were) for all kinde of prayer.

If Masse be oftentimes used for any kinde of prayer, as you

Thenasse
in the olde
church
was some
times ce-
lebrated
after
noone.

Epiphani.
in fine
Panarj.
Augustin.
Epist. 118.
ad Iannari-
um ad
finem.
Dist. 75.
quod a pa-
tribus.

A Reioindre to

say, why do you not shew vs some plain place, wher it signifieth
either Matines, or Euen-song, or Chapeine? Or why allege you
not at least one sentence of some Father, where it is used and
taken for the prayers of the Third, Sixth, or Ninth houre, com-
monly named of the Fathers, Tertia, Sexta, Nona? If you haue
no such place to shewe, cal backe your worde againe, and say we
more, that Masse is used oftentimes for any kinde of prayer.
In a Council holden at Carthage, we haue a plaine distinc-
tion and difference expressed betwene Masse, and prayers in gene-
ral. The wordes be these. *Ve sacramenta altaris non nisi ieu-
nis hominibus celebratur, excepto vno die anniuersario, quo et
na Domini celebratur. Nam si aliquorum pomeridiano tempore
defunctorum, siue episcoporum, siue ceterorum, commendatio
facienda est, solis orationibus fiat, si illi qui faciunt, iam pransi in-
ueniantur. we ordeine that the Sacramentes of the aulter be not
celebrated but of men fasting, except one pccely day, in which our
Lords supper or Maundie is celebrated. For if commendation
of any, either of bishops, or of the rest, be to be done at afternone,
let it be done with prayers only, if they who do it, be found to
haue dyed. Were it so ordeined that commendation of such as
depart this life at afternoone, be done forthwith with prayers,
and not with Masse, in which the Sacramentes of the aulter are
celebrated, in case the priests that should say Masse, be not fa-
sting, which Decree argueth a plaine difference betwene Masse,
and every other kinde of prayers. For if the Masse then had sig-
nified any kinde of prayer, the Fathers of that Council would
not haue ordeined Commendation of the dead to be made Soli
orationibus, with prayers only. For though Masse had been said,
yet the commendation had been done with only prayers, in which
Masse it selfe signified any kinde of prayer.
Of this Decree we may gather a probable consequence, for
that*

Chrysost.
hom. 59. ad
popul. An-
tiochen.

Ang. serm.
55. de tem-
pore.

That the
Masse is
different &
distinct fro
other pray-
ers.

Council.
Carthag.
3. Ca. 29.

Sheweth
these
wordes,
with pray-
ers only.

that Mr. Jewel calleth private Masse; for whereas it is said here, that commendation of them that died in the afternoon, is to be made with prayers only; and not with Masse, if the priest have broken his fast: seeing therof it appeareth, that if the priest were fasting, he might make the deads commendation also with Masse in the afternoon: then if a sufficient company of the people were not found fasting, and disposed to receive the Communion with the priest: certaine it is, that in this case saying Masse & celebrating the Sacraments of the altar for the departed, he should say private Masse, that is to say, he should celebrate Masse without a company of others founde fasting and receiving the Sacrament with him. And if the Fathers of that Council had ben of the opinion that Mr. Jewel is of, that is, that Masse can not be done otherwise a number be ready to receive the Sacrament with the priest: doubtlesse they would have mentioned the sake of the necessary Communicantes, as of the priest that should celebrate Masse. for els had their Decree lacked foresight in a thing of necessity. which of so many wise, learned, and godly Fathers is not to be thought.

To prove that Masse is sometimes taken for any kinde of prayer, among other weake conjectures, you alleg a place out of Nicephorus. which may wel seeme to make against you, for you it maketh nothing at al. The place is this, as you translate it. At Alexandria, they read the scriptures upon VVenesdaies, and Frydaies, and the Doctors or preachers expounde the same. (These wordes following are specially to be considered.) Omniaque quæ ad Synaxin pertinent, peragebant, præterquam Divinorum Mysteriorum perceptionem. And they do al thinges that appertaine unto the Communion, saying onely the receiving of the holy Sacraments. And this custome there they have had of olde.

Where I can not conceive to what ende you have broughte

II. iii.

this

A very
probable
argument
for proofs
of private
Masse.

Nicephorus.
lib. 12.
cap. 34.

A Reioindre to

this place of Nicephorus, neither what dependance there is in your wordes. You pretend to proue, that Missa importeth not the Masse, in the place by me alleged out of Leontius. For say you, Missa is oftentimes vsed for any kinde of prayer. And for assurance therof you referre vs to your former piouses by sundry autorities, which be no piouses, as now I haue declared. Then you send vs further to an Epistle of Thomastus and Heliodorus, that (I trow) was neuer yet esteemed nor alleged of any learned man. And where it is, God knoweth, very obscure it is and little worth, for els you would haue shewed vs, where we might fynde it. If it be theirs so assuredly, as the wordes of the Council of Sabilon, which you speake of, be the wordes of that Council: then is it not their Epistle, for those wordes vnto which you direct vs by your quotation, be not to be found in al Council. These be Summers in dede, & speak nothing for them self, much lesse speake they ought for you. If they had ben worth y hearing, you would not thus haue brought them in dumme. Neither can this strange matter so easily be proued by the names of dumme witnesses.

After this you procede forth and say thus. Which thing also very well agreeth with the custome and order of the church of Alexandria at that time, vnder Nicephorus writeth thus. Quarta hebdomadis die, &c. But what thing is y agreed very well to the custome of Alexandria? Remember you wherof you spake: How hangerth this to that goeth before? At Alexandria the Doctors expounded the scriptures vpon weekdaies and Frydaies. And they had al things denne that apperteyne to the Synaxis, sauing the receiuing of the holy mysteries. What then? Conclude here of, Ego Missa oftentimes taken for any kinde of prayer, for this is y your conclusion, els you conclude nothing. If you conclude nothing, why did you allege it? If this be your conclusion, proue it not to be

Ad. Ict.
makech a
foolish
Conclusion

a foolish conclusion. How holdeth the Argument? By what rules of Logique can you make it good? What neuer learned Logique, may some see the peeuishnesse of it.

As your Argument deduced out of this place of Nicephorus, is naught worth, so is your translation false, touching this worde Synaxis, wherupon y^e whole matter dependeth. Synaxis signifieth in this place not y^e Communion of the body and blood of Christ, but an assemblie & coming together of y^e people to y^e church, or to some other holy place, to pray, to render thanks and praise vnto God. These comminges together to pray and worship God, were appointed by the Apostles to be kept vpon y^e weekdaies, Frydaies, and Sondates, as Epiphanius writeth. The worde is much vsed of the Greke Fathers, and specially of them of the Council of Gangra. In Latine of the best learned it is called Collecta. And whereas the Common translation of the Council of Gangra, hath for συναξαις μαρτυρων, Conuentus, qui per loca, & basilicas Sanctorum Martyrum sunt: it is thought ynough for those two Greke wordes, to lay downe these two latine wordes, Collectas Martyrum. where your worde Communiones Martyrum, will not serue. And therfore is not the translation of Ianus Cornarius of Germanie to be liked, where he translateth out of Epiphanius the place aboue mentioned, συναξαις, into Communiones.

In the primitive Church they signified this holy coming together by the worde Colligere alone. For so Tertullian speaketh in the ende of his booke, De fuga in persecutione. Sed quomodo colligemus, inquires? quomodo Dominica solennia celebrabimus? How shal we come to Church together, then wilt say? How shal we kepe our Lordes solenne feastes? So Synaxis is a companie and an assemblie of faithful folke together to serue God. which by one woorde in Latine is called

Synaxis,
what it
signifieth
in Nicephorus &
in many
other places.

Epiphanius
in fine
Panarij.
Concilio
Gangren.
Cap. 20.

Collectas
Martyrum

Colligere.
Tertullian
Synaxis,
& Collecta signifieth one thing verie often.

A Reioindre to

Collecta. And this worde Collecta is found in the olde translation of the Bible not seldome. Leuitici. cap. 23. Dies octauus erit celeberrimus, atque sanctissimus, est enim dies coetus atque collectæ. The eight day shall be the most solemne and holiest of al. for it is a day of comming together to serue God, as much to say, a holy day. The worde is likewise vsed Deuter. 16. and 2. Paralipom. 7.

The place of Nicephorus tourned vpon Ag. Jewel. Synaxis is a celebration of faithful peoples meeting at church to serue God.

Concerning the place of Nicephorus, whereas at Alexandria vpon the Wednesdayes and Fridayes al thinges were donne that apperteyne to an assemblie, or to a holy day (for so much the worde Synaxis soundeth) and the Masse specially and chiefly apperteyned to such a solemnitie: thereof it appeareth; that they had the Masse done by the Priest, without the peoples receiuing of the Sacrament. For they had al thinges that apperteyned vnto a Synaxis (which what it was, may be described with many wordes better, then signified with any one English worde) and so it semeth to be an euident testimonie for private Masse. For thus the Argument may be framed. What so euer belonged to Synaxis, that had they. The Masse chiefly belonged to Synaxis, & is to say to the celebration of a holy meeting at Church: Ergo they had the Masse. then further. But they had not the receiuing of the holy Mysteries: Ergo, the Priest celebrated Masse, that is to say, consecrated, offered, and receiued the body and bloud of Christe, without the people receiuing with him, which is that these men call private Masse. Thus Nicephorus place is founde not onely impertinent to your purpose, but also such as may be retourned vpon your owne head.

Ieruel.

Touching these wordes, *Benedicere sancta*, they do no more signifye the Consecration of the Sacrament, as M. Harding hath translated it,

then.

then these vvorde, extollite manus vestras in sancta, do signifie the lifting vp of handes to the Sacrament. Chrysostome in his Liturgie, vseth the same manner of speech to a farre other purpose. For after the Communion is ended, and the people ready to depart forth, he writeth thus, Sacerdos benedicir Sancta, & exuit. Here if M. Harding wil take Benedicere Sancta, for Consecration, then must needes folow a great inconuenience, that there were two Consecrations in one Communion, yea, and one Consecration, after al was ended. It may appeare, that Chrysostome by these vvorde meant a solemne prayer to conclude the whole.

Harding.

Were it so that S. Chrysostome by these wordes Benedicere Sancta, meant a solemne prayer to conclude the whole, as you ghesse, yet thereby in Leontius may be signified the Consecration of the holy Mysteries. For one worde may be taken in diuerse senses. Because this very worde Benedicere signifieth sometimes blessing on Gods behalfe towards man, as where it is said, Benedixit Deus Noe, & filijs eius: God blessed Noe, and his children: That we say therefore, that it is not an other where taken in an euil sense, as where it is said, Benedixit Naboth Deo & Regi, Naboth did blaspheme God and the King: Because this worde Calix, Cuppe, is taken for a Cuppe in one place, That we therefore say, it is not taken for the passion in an other place: As where Christ said, O my Father if it be possible, let this cuppe passe from me. So what so euer Benedicere Sancta signifieth in S. Chrysostomes Liturgie, yet notwithstanding in this place of Leontius, it may be taken to signifie the Consecration of the Sacrament, as I haue before proved. And this your common manner of reasoning, which by the auouching of one truth, excludeth an other truth, is of al others the simplest, and weakest. Yet except an infinite

Gen. 9.

3. Reg. 21

1. Cor. 10

Mat. 26.

The chief
furniture
of this
whole
booke is
to exclude
one truth
by an o.
ther truth

W W H

number

A Reioindre to

number of manifest vnttruthes, it is the chiefe furniture of your whole booke.

where you say further concerning this phrase, & the meaning of it, seemeth to be the same & S. Chrysostomes is at the end of his Masse: your conceit had ben reasonable, if Leontius had attributed it vnto this holy Patriarche at the ende also of his Masse. But seeing that his words be these, Cum ergo Sancta benedixisset Patriarcha, & orationem Dominicam inchoasset: who so euer hath skill of Ecclesiastical antiquities, can not but iudge these wordes to appertaine to that part of the Masse, that is about the Consecration of the Mysteries befoze the receiuing, and therfoze much moze befoze the end. For there be sundry auncient records beside S. Hierome witnessing, that our Lordes prayer was said befoze the body and blond of Christ were receiued. And some say that the Apostles them selues vsed so to doo, when so euer they celebrated the most holy Mysteries, according to the commandement that Christ gaue them at his last Supper. This much being considered, my translation of benedicere sancta, is nothing disproued by the doubtful rubric of S. Chrysostomes Masse. But let vs discusse your other good stiffe.

Vide Beatum Rhenanum in annotat. in Tertul. De Corona Militis

Iewel.

Doubtlesse it was a very strait case, that a noble Man should be drinen to helpe the Priest to Masse.

Harding.

Doubtlesse it is a strait case, that M. Jewel for lacke of better mater, is drinen to stiffe his booke with such light ware, that better becometh a mocking boy, then a Superintendent. And wherof gather you, & the noble man holpe the Patriarche to Masse? Because he said our Lordes prayer with him? Remember you not, that in the Greeke Church our Lordes prayer was said of the whole people at Masse, as it is said of the.

the Priest only in the Latine Church: This much if you knewe not, you might haue learned of S. Gregory epist. 63. ad Ioannem Episcop. Syracusan. This saying of the Pater noster with the Patriarke was donne after the manner of the Beke Church, and not by way of seruing a Priest to Masse. Neither was he dyen so to do at al. That he did, was of common custome and of Deuotion, not of compulsion, nor so much as of request. Neither was he so noble, but that Patriarke both by dignitie of his rone, and by the high function of his Priesthood, specially whe in the person of Christe he consecrated his most precious body and bloude at the autler, was much nobler. If you had read the eloquent worke of S. Chrysostome, De dignitate Sacerdotali, and belened it: you would not haue made so great a wonder, that any man, were he neuer so noble, should answere not onely the great Patriarke of Alexandria, the second Bishop of the worlde, but any Priest what so euer he were celebrating those honozable and dreadfull mysteries.

Jewel.

It is a straite case for M. Harding, to renne to Alexandria * a thousand miles beyonde al Chrystendome to seeke his Masse, and that not in open Church neither, but onely in a priuate Oratorie.

Harding.

It is a straite case that M. Jewel, who takerd vpon him to be a champion of the late deuised Gospel, is dyuen to defende his vaine Challenge with scornefull scoffes, and open lyes. When this holy Patriarke John the mercifull lyued, it is wel known, that Alexandria was one of the chiefe lightes of Chrystendome, howsoeuer it be of late yeres destroyd by warres, & now come into the Dominion of the Turkes, as Egypt and Syria is. Neither is it now in our time after so great mutations of thinges, a thousand miles from Chrystendome, as you say. For the

Landes

Chry. 83.
vntill.
Alexan-
dia is yet
neare to
some por-
te of Chry-
stendome,
and at
that time
was a
chiefe
light of al
Chrysten-
dom.

A Reioindre to

Landes of Cypres and Cadië, which are a parte of Chriſtendom, and at this day vnder the gouernement of the Venetians, are not farre from it, as Cosmographers can tel you.

Ans. Jew.
takerh ex-
ception
againſt
places.
*Alexan-
dria.*

Merely it is a token that you miſtruſt your owne Challenge, ſith that you begynne now to take exception againſt places. For if you wil not alow vs Alexandria, where S. Marke firſt taught the faith, where many thouſandes of Martyrs haue ſuffred death for Chriſte, where Papias, where Pantenus, where Clement, where Origen, where S. Archanasius, where Theophilus, where Didimus, and many other excellent learned Fathers haue expounded ſcriptures, preached, wiſten, & by al meanes ſet forth ſaith and defended it againſt tyrantes and heretikes: I know not what is that place, againſt which you wil not take exception. By as good right you may reſuſe the prouſes of thinges in olde time donne, at Conſtantinople, at Carthage, at Chalcedon, at Ephesus, at Nice, in Græcia, Asia, Syria, Aegypte, Africa, at Antiochia, Yea at Hieruſalem it ſelfe: becauſe al theſe cities and Countreies be now come into the handes of miſcreantes, and be at this day no parte of Chriſtendome. And ſo by this reaſon we may ſeige nothing out of the firſt Councels for prouſe of any neceſſary doctrine, becauſe it might be ſaid, that we ranne many hundred miles beyonde al Chriſtendome for our prouſes.

Ans. Jew.
altereth
the ſtate
and pur-
poſe of
his Cha-
lenge.

Neither be you now dynen to take exception againſt Cities and Countreies only, that be taken from the poſſeſſion of Chriſten men: but alſo againſt priuate Oratories, and againſt certayne Fathers. For now beginning to ſtagger, you alter the former purpoſe of your Challenge, and require vs to ſhewe you prouſe of priuate Maſſe ſaid, not in Oratories, but in open Church, in the face and ſight of al the people, and the ſame witneſſed by S. Auguſtine, S. Hierome, S. Chryſoſtome,

softsome, or some other aunient Fathers, which your selfe can be content to allowe. These your tergiversations and bare shifts, do manifestly betwray both y^e weakenes of your cause, and your great impudencie.

Jévvél.

In the Tripartite-Storie it is written * thus: Gregorie Nazianzen at Constantinople in a little Oratorie, συναγωγὰς ἐποίητο, made assemblies of the people. Here we see the Actiō was common, and a full Communion ministred, not vnderstanding the place were priuate.

The. 184
vntruth.
It is not
written
thus. Acc
the booke
be trial.

Harding.

First the Breake of Sozomenus: who is the author of the
 Storie here alleged, hath not those words συναγωγὰς ποιῆτο,
 much to say, by your translation. he made assemblies of the people.

Hist. tri-
part. li. 9.
cap. 8.

neither hath the Latine booke, from whence you tooke the
so as you haue falsified, but thus: in paruo oratorio sacra
bat, that is. *S. Gregorie Nazianzene* kept diuine seruice
in the Oratorie or chappel. This is a place by you of purpose
alleged, neither can it by any way or colour be excused. If such
manifest lyes and falsifyinges may stande for good psones, you
may be let slippe to make a new Challenge to morow nexte, not
only against the present Catholike Church, but also against the
olde Fathers, yea against *S. Paule* and *Christe* him selfe: For
this libertie being graunted you, wordes shal not lacke, at least
to make a shewe.

Vide Sozomenum
Gracum.
li. 7. cap. 5.
The tripartite
Storie
falsified
by M. J.
wel.

Isyvel:

Thus then gentle Reader, standeth my answer to this tale. First, That it was forbidden by many Decrees to minister the Sacrament in private houses: and therefore unlikely that Iohn Almonar being a godly man would presume to do the Contrarie.

The. 18.
vnttruth.
It was
not forbid
den by
Decrees,
that the
Sacra-
mēt in so-
me cases
should be
ministered
in houses,
it was con-
demned.

A Reioindre to

Landes of Cypres and Cădie, which are a parte of Chriſtendome, and at this day vnder the gouernement of the Venetians, are not farre from it, as Cosmographers can tel you.

Ans. Jew.
taketh ex-
ception
against
places.
*Alexan-
dria.*

Merely it is a token that you mistrust your owne Challenge, ſith that you begynne now to take exception againſt places. For if you wil not allow vs Alexandria, where S. Marke firſt taught the faith, where many thouſandes of Martyrs haue ſuffered death for Chriſte, where Papias, where Pantenus, where Clement, where Origen, where S. Athanaſius, where Theophilus, where Didimus, and many other excellent learned Fathers haue expounded ſcriptures, preached, wiſten, & by al meanes ſet forth ſaith and defended it againſt tyrantes and heretikes: I know not what is that place, againſt which you wil not take exception. By as good right you may reſuſe the prouſes of thinges in olde time donne, at Conſtantinople, at Carthage, at Chalcedon, at Ephesus, at Nice, in Græcia, Aſia, Syria, Aegypte, Africa, at Antiochia, Yea at Hieruſalem it ſelfe: becauſe al theſe citieſ and Countreſ be now come into the handes of miſcreantes, and be at this day no parte of Chriſtendome. And ſo by this reaſon we may alledge nothing out of the firſt Councels for prouſe of any neceſſary doctrine, becauſe it might be ſaid, that we ranne many hundred miles beyonde al Chriſtendome for our prouſes.

Ans. Jew.
altereth
the ſtate
and pur-
poſe of
his Cha-
lenge.

Neither be you now dynen to take exception againſt Citieſ and Countreſ only, that be taken from the poſſeſſion of Chriſten men: but alſo againſt priuate Oratores, and againſt certaine Fathers. For now beginning to ſtaggar, you alter the former purpoſe of your Challenge, and require vs to ſhewe you prouſe of priuate Maſſe ſaid, not in Oratores, but in open Church, in the face and ſight of al the people, and the ſame witneſſed by S. Auguſtine, S. Hierome, S. Chryſoſtome,

softome, or some other auncient Fathers, which your selfe can be content to allowe. These your tergiversations and bare shiftes, do manifestly betwray both y^e weakenes of your cause, and your great impudencie.

Iewel.

In the Tripartite Storie it is written * thus: Gregorie Nazianzen at Constantinople in a litle Oratorie, *συναγωγὰς ἐποίητο*, made assemblies of the people. Here we see the Actio was common, and a full Communion ministered, notwithstanding the place were private.

Harding.

First the Breke of Sozomenus: who is the author of the Storie here alleged, hath not those wordes *συναγωγὰς ἐποίητο*, as much to say, by your translation, he made assemblies of the people. Next neither hath the Latine booke, from whence you tooke the place, so as you haue falsified, but thus: in paruo oratorio sacra celebrabat, that is. S. Gregorie Nazianzene kept diuine Service in a litle Oratorie or chappel. This is a place by you of purpose falsified, neither can it by any way or colour be excused. If such manifest lyes and falsifyinges may stande for good prouises, you may be let slippe to make a new Challenge to morow nexte, not only against the present Catholike Church, but also against the olde Fathers, yea against S. Paule and Christe him selfe. For this libertie being graunted you, wordes shal not lacke, at least to make a shewe.

Iewel.

Thus then gentle Reader, standeth my answer to this tale. Firſt, *that it was forbidden by many Decrees to minister the Sacrament in priuate houses: and therefore vnlkely that Iohn Almonar being a godly man would presume to doe the Contrarie.

VV. iij.

Harding

The. 184
vnttruth.
It is not
written
thus. Let
the booke
be trial.

Hist. tri-

part. li. 9.

cap. 8.

Vide Soz-

menum

Gracum.

li. 7. cap. 5.

The tri-

partite

Storie

falsified

by M. Ie-

wel.

The. 185.

vnttruth.

It was

not forbid-

den by

Decrees,

that the

Sacra-

ment in so-

me cases

should be

ministered

in houses,

it was co-

mmended.

A Reioindre to

Harding.

*Conc. Vi-
cen. ca. 12.*

*De Conf.
dist. 1. Mis-
sarum so-
lennia.
Item nul-
lus presby-
ter. Item
Clericos
qui mini-
strant.*

*Ad. Iew.
allegeth
Decrees
for him sel-
fe, whose
wordes
being con-
trary to
him, he is
ashamed
to utter.*

To this I haue answered before. It was not forbidden, but rather commaunded by sundry Decrees in certaine cases to minister the Sacrament in priuate houses. As for example, if any had layen at pointe of death, and required to receiue his viage prouision, the blessed Sacrament was ministered vnto him in his priuate house, yea in his priuey bedchamber. If you meane, that the Masse was forbidden to be celebrated in priuate houses, I graunte: onlesse for some necessitie leaue of the Bishop thereto had ben obtained. Whiles you be afraid to name the Masse, and to signifie the same, terme it to minister the Sacrament: you shew your selfe to be lesse ashamed of making a lye, then of vsing that terme, which the Decrees that you allege for you, haue vsed. You be not ashamed to allege the Decrees, you be ashamed to recite their wordes.

Here I might say, the Patriarkes house of Alexandria, was not priuate, and therfore those Decrees pertain not vnto it. But Leontius nameth not his house, but his Oratorie. which Oratorie was consecrated, and therfore was it lawfull in the same to celebrate Masse. The Decrees that forbid Masse to be donne in houses, are to be vnderstanded to speake of common and prophane dwelling houses, and not of consecrated places. So this godly man saying Masse in his Oratorie presumed nothing contrary to the Decrees made in that behalfe.

Iewel.

Secondly, that this worde *Missa* vsed here by the rude and viterly vnlarned Interpreter, doth not necessarily import the Masse.

Harding.

The interpreters small skill of the Latine tongue, maketh no argument, that *Missa* doth not import the Masse. Though his Latine were meane, yet the Doctrine of the Catholike Church

is not to be condemned. The circumstance of the place argueth it was the Masse. He had Latine ynough to signifie so much. If it like you not, that Missa shal signifie the Masse, then cause your frende M. Cooper of Oxford to set forth a new Dictionary, and tell him that from hence forth Missa must not be Englished the Masse, but the new Communion, the ministracion of the Sacramentes, the assemblie of the people, or some other preaty thing, wherby it may be put out of euery mans head, that the Church of Chryste in olde time had Masse. If you could bying this to passe, and withal burne the bookes of so many auncient Fathers, and Councels, and olde Decrees: I promise you it were a notable feate, and a great furtherance to your Gospel. For as long as thes continue, the Masse wil neuer out of memoie.

I shifting deuise, to abolish the name and memoie of the Masse.

Iewel.

Thirdly that M. Harding the better to furnish out the matter, hath violently, and wof purpose, falsified the translation.

The. 186. Intruth. There is neither violence, nor any false purpose in my translation, as I haue proued.

Harding.

Had I so donne, I perceiue your courtesie would not haue picked violently to charge me therewith. My translation is true and good, as the same I haue before iustified.

Iewel.

Fourthly, that notwithstanding here were graunted the Celebration of the Sacrament yet it can not be forced thereof, that the priest receiued alone.

Harding.

What meane you by the celebration of the Sacrament? You vse termes of doubtful and manifold signification, to haue striking holes at nede. Will you stil be afraid to name that you persecute, except you name it with spite? I can not force it of this holy Fathers Masse, you say, that the priest receiued alone.

M. Iew. purposeth to graunt none, then he is enforced to graunt.

¶¶ 1,

why

A Reioindre to

Underp he
sheweth
what re-
uerence &
obedience
he beareth
towards
the church

why say be you at that point with vs, that you will graunt no-
thing more, then we can enforce you vnto? wel then, this much
can we enforce vpon you touching this place. That any person
receined with the Patriarke, it is not reported. There were but
two others present, when he said Masse. Of them the one, I
meane the noble man, for good cause was not, (as in my booke

Fol. 27. a I haue declared) to be admitted vnto the receiuing of the myste-
ries. Then if any receined with the Patriarke, it was but one
onely person. But to a Communion thre be necessarily required
at least besides the priest, by your owne Doctrine, as we fynde in
your Communion booke that is of the last and fynest making,
and most Benenian like: ergo, it was a Masse without a com-
panie receiuing the Communion together with the priest, which
your Gospel calleth a priuate Masse. For plainesse sake, this is
my argument. where so euer a priest saith Masse without a com-
panie receiuing with him, there is (if I may vse your terme) a
priuate Masse said. But this Patriarke at his Masse had not a
companie receiuing with him: Ergo, he said priuate Masse.

An argu-
ment pro-
ving that
S. John
the Patri-
arke of A-
lexandria
said pri-
uate masse

I saye.

Fifthly, that although this were proued a priuate Masse, yet hath
M. Harding viterly misserackened him selfe, and so gotten nothing. For it
was without the compasse of sixe hundred yeres.

Harding.

Q. I saye:
liketh at
a yere or
two, as
though
time made
the Masse
good of it.

It appeareth by the wordes of the second Aiken Conncel
about reherfed, by which it is repoized, that Leontius the wytes
of this holy fathers life, lyued in the time of Mauricius the
Emperour: that he might haue said this Masse within the sixe
hundred yeres. For certaine it is that Leontius wrote his life,
after the time that he had gotten renome and fame for his great
vertue, which maketh an argument that he lyued within the six
hundred yeres. For Mauricius was lyuing at the very terme
of.

of those yerres, as it may wel be proued by the histories of that age. Now take you this withal, that the second Council of Nice, is to be credited before Vincentius. But for this I wil not strue with M. Iewel. If he graunt it was a priuate Masse, I would faine learne of him, why it should be condemned being said nine or ten yeares after the date of the said six hundred yeares, and allowed for good, if it had ben said a day or two, or a yeare, before the terme of the six hundred yeares. If it had ben good & godly before, why was it not so after? If it were good & godly after, why might it not be so before? Merely the time maketh it neither better, nor worse. Graunt it once to haue ben a Masse, & afterwarde it shal be proued, that it was good and godly. If that be proued, as in dede you haue no reason to disproue any partce of the Masse: what cause haue you now to impugne it? And if it may be found good now, then had it not ben euill with in the six hundred yeares. And that is ynough.

Iewel.

Last of al herevnto I adde, that the place, vvhether these thinges are imagined to be done, vvas il chosen, and very vnlkely to serue this purpose. For M. Harding is not able to proue, that in the Citie of Alexandria, vvas euer any one priuate Masse said, either before that time, or sithens.

Harding.

What is this other, but vaine trifling, and Petitio principij. Petitio principij, as they cal it in schooles? You seme to haue spent your stuffe, that you prouided for this Diuision. And to say the truth, fewer wordes would better haue serued. If I haue so wel proued Masse without a company of receiners in Alexandria, which place you say is il chose, and very vnlkely to serue this purpose: then may the discrete Reader iudge therof, how much better able I maye be to proue it by the practise of the Church in other places.

¶

¶

A Reioindre to

The xxxij. Division.

In this place I report a storie thought to be written by Amphilo-
chius the famous bishop of Iconium, declaring how S.
Walsile celebrated Masse in a vision. For alleging which
storie M. Jewel thinketh himselfe to haue great aduantage a-
gainst me. And because through my whole booke he findeth not
the like aduantage, therefore he maketh the most of it. How be it
if al be duly considered, it shal appeare to the indifferent reader,
that he hath not gayned so much by shewing the storie to be of
suspecte credite, as he hath lost, by his vaine and vnttrue dealing
in disprouing the same. If it be but a dycaine, and a fable, as he
saith it is, what nede was there to make so much ado about
nought? who genereth that Capitain the praise of noble courage,
that benderh his whole strength and power against a weake
foyte? Yet this fable, as light as he maketh of it, must be talked
of at Haules Crosse, aduise must be taken how it might be blo-
wen ouer al England, to the discredite of my Answer vnto his
Chalenge. And now al the circumstances be reherled againe
in this place, and nothing leste vntouched, that may helpe to de-
face it. So great stirre, as he maketh about it, were ynough to
make a wise man beleue, it were no fable, but rather a true tale,
specially being so vehemently, and with so many words impug-
ned by one, that saime would haue it seme a fable.

As touching myne owne parte, whether it be a vaine fable,
or a true storie, I define nothing, as neither whether Amphilo-
chius be the autho; of it, or any other man, Certaine it is, I am
not

not the first that haue said, that Amphilo-
 chius wrote S. Basiles life, nor that haue made mention of these very things in the
 same contained. For this hath ben acknowledged & reported by
 sundry learned men both of this age, and of times past, by Aloy-
 sius Lipomanus in vitis Patrum, by Gropperus in his booke of the
 blessed Sacrament, by Raphael Volaterranus in Monodia Gre-
 gorij Nazianzeni, by Iacobus Philippus Bergomensis in supple-
 mento, by Antoninus Archebishop of Florence, by Vincentius
 Bellouacensis in speculo historiali, by Sigebertus in Chronicis.
 And, which M. Jewel esteemeth more then al these, by Mathias
 Flacius Illyricus and his felowes hote Gospellers, that be the
 gatherers of the storie of Magdeburg. who very oftentimes
 speaking of S. Basile do allege this Amphilo-
 chius, although I confesse sometimes they seme to doubt of that is extant in Am-
 philochius name. So that I returne M. Jewel ouer vnto al
 these, and require him to bestowe his scoffes and mockes vpon
 them, who haue herein ben deceiued before me, if they were de-
 ceined at al.

But whether this be Amphilo-
 chius or no, let vs consider
 partly the weaknesse of M. Jewels argumentes, and partly the
 vntue reportes that he maketh to disproue him. Of the booke
 that he hath had in his owne librarie these .xx. yeres, he may say
 what him listeth. It maketh nothing against the authoritie of o-
 ther bookes, that he founde els where containing this storie. It
 appeareth that his booke and myne be not one. For certainly
 he allegeth many things, that my booke hath not. And he him-
 selfe here saith, that his booke beareth not the name of Amphilo-
 chius. Perhaps it is some Collection out of that they cal Vi-
 tas patrum, wherein part of Amphilo-
 chius is contained. Reason
 would, he should not ground himselfe, and affirme so much vpon
 the credite of an vncertaine booke,

what lear-
 ned wy-
 ters haue
 made me-
 tion of the
 life of S.
 Basil, as
 written by
 Amphilo-
 chius, or
 of the
 things
 concerning
 S. Basil
 in the sto-
 ry of this
 Amphilo-
 chius con-
 tained.
 parte. 2.
 tit. 10. ca. 4
 lib. 16.
 cap. 94.

A Reioindre to

That the life of S. Thomas the Martyr and Archbishop of Cantorbury, was ioyned with his booke, it maketh no argument against Amphiloehus. For treatises of men of diuerse ages may be bounde together within one volume at the pleasure of the owner, and yet shal not the authoꝝ of the former, be thoughte (as M. Jewel obiectioneth) to write a prophēcy, and to be a prophet in respect of the later. For els Laro the elder writing De rusticis, should seme to haue written a prophēcie of Palladius, that liued long after him, whose bookes be printed and bound in one volume. Likewise Titus Linius should be taken for a prophete in respect of Lucius Florus, that is printed with him. This was a very sonde reason, neither worthy to be tolde at Daules Crosse, as it was with great reioyning of mo then young witts, nor to be set foꝝth in print to suffer his Replie,

Iewel.

The. 187. Truth.
The life of S. Basil hath not ben set foꝝth fully by these fathers, their be-kes do controul this Truth.

The. 188. Truth.
Vincentius in Speculo maketh mention of the miraculons Balle of S. Basil, as here it is shewed.

The life of S. Basil hath ben set foꝝth *fully, and faithfully, by sundry olde woꝝthy woꝝtters, as by his owne brother Gregorius Nyssenus, by his dere frende Gregorie Nazianzene, by Gregorius presbyter, by Socrates, by Theodoretus, by Sozomenus, by Nicephorus, touched also in diuerse places by Chrysostom. And notwithstanding of late yeres he that wrote Vitae patrum, and Iacobus de Voragine, and Vincentius in speculo, vho seme to intitile this booke by the name of Amphiloehus, haue furnished the same with many vnsauery vaine tales, *yet vvas there none of them so impudent, once to make any mention of this pecunish tale of M. Hardinges Masse.

Harding

Harding.

There is neuer a one of al these olde writers, that haith fully
set forth the life of S. Basile. Gregorius Nyssenus his brother
doth but praise his vertues, and so; the same compareth him
with the Sainctes of the Olde and newe Testament. S. Gre-
gorie Nazianzene writeth much, yet not a full storie of his life,
but onely an Oration to be made in his praise at his burial, and
so it is called in Greeke *Λόγος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοῦ* a funeral oration: though
he came to Cæsarea, where S. Basile was bishop, and there pro-
nounced it a long time after he had ben buried, as Gregorius
presbyter writeth. Gregorius presbyter, wrote the life of Gre-
gorie Nazianzene, but that euer he wrote the life of S. Basile, I
haue not yet learned. As for Socrates, Theodoretus, Sozo-
menus, and Nicephorus, they can not be said to haue written
his life: In their Stories they haue only as it were by the
way, and vpon an occasion generall, touched somewhat concer-
ning his life. But that is farre from writing a full storie of
his life.

Gregorius
Nyssenus
wrote not
of Basile's
life.
Gregorie
Nazian-
zene.
Gregorius
presbyter
wrote Na-
zianzen's

Of al others S. Gregorie Nazianzene wrote thereof most
amply, yet of his Miracles, which doubtesse he had vertue to
worke sundry and great, (for els how could he haue ben iustly
compared with the chiefe Fathers of both testaments?) he made
no mention. The storie of whose Miracles seemeth to be the pro-
fession of the booke, that beareth the name of Amphilochois,
which notwithstanding I haue not to be his. For here I
shewe only the vntruthes of your sayings, and the febleness
of your reasons.

Whereas you say of the rest, that none of the was so impudent
as once to make any mention of this strange manner of S. Basiles
Deasse, which wordes import an vn courteous & bitter surmise of
me: it may please you to rebuke your selfe of an vntruth.

¶¶. 119.

For

A Reioindre to

Vincentius maketh mention of it in *speculo*. Where he
lib. 16. saith this much alleged out of *Sigebertus*. *Basiliius Cæsariensis*
cap. 94. gemina philosophia, & sanctitate claruerat. Cui Deus apparens
 ad precem eius eum docuit, vt proprijs verbis sanctum Sacrificiũ
 consecraret. *Basile* Bishop of *Cæsarea* had gotten him a fanie
 through both his philosophies and holinesse. whom God ap-
 pearing vnto him at the prayer which he made, taught to Con-
 secrate the holy Sacrifice, with prayers of his owne making.

Antoninus Furthermoze if it wil plese you to read *Antoninus* before named
Archiepif- Parte. 2. titulo. 10. cap. 4. you shal finde the same very thing,
copus Flo- which you cal a peenish fable of *M. Hardings Masse*, that here
rentinus. I haue alleged, fully and wholly rebersted worde for worde.
 which when you shal haue read, I trust you wil discharge me of
 the foule crime of impudencie, sith the storie is mentioned by
Antoninus, *Vincentius*, and *Sigebertus*.

levvel.

Socrates and *Sozomenus* say, that *Basil* in his youth vvas *Libanius* scho-
 lar: *M. Hardings Amphilocheus* saith, *Basil* vvas *Libanius* schoollfellowe.

Harding.

Socrat. lib. Both *Socrates* and *Sozomenus* say, that *S. Basile* and *S.*
4. cap. 26. *Gregorie Nazianzen* when they were yong men at *Athens*, went
Sozom. li. to the Schooles of *Dimerius* and *Protrelius* the most famous
6. cap. 17. Sophistes of that time: and that afterward they went to heare
Libanius at *Antiochia*. Concerning both their going to schoole
 with *Libanius*, notwithstanding what so euer they wrote, it
 may be doubted of. For neither *Gregorius* presbyter, maketh

The places that
S. Grego-
rie Nazi-
anzen and
S. Basil
 went vnto
 for learning.

any mention of it in *S. Gregorie Nazianzens* life, reporting to
 what places for learning he went vnto, first, to *Cæsarea*, next in-
 to *Dalestina*, after that to *Alexandria* and to *Isbaros*, and last of
 al to *Athens*, where he found *S. Basile*: And *S. Gregorie*
Nazianzen in *Epitaphio* saith of *S. Basile*, that first he went
 to

to schoole at Cesarea, next at Bizantium, after that at Athens, and that from Athens he retourned home to Cesarea. From thence after a while by occasion of troubles that rose through heretiques, he went into Pontus, and there remained in studie of Divinitie conferring with the said Gregorie thirteen yeares, and then retourned home vnto his Countie Cesarea, where at length he was made Bishop. That he was at any time Libanius scholar, it can not by these two Gregories appeare.

And very likely it is, that if he had ben Libanius scholar, some mention thereof should haue ben made, either by S. Basile him selfe, or by Libanius, in one or other of those slyddy familiar Epistles, which they wrote one to the other, specially whereas in the same they speake most of Eloquence, and of Scholars which S. Basile sent from Cappadocia to Libanius, and of the profession of Rhetorique, for which at those daies Libanius at Antiochia was famous. Libanius in an Epistle to S. Basile, to perswade him that he had not forgotten him, saith that he knew him, when he was a yong man. But that he was his Schoolemaister he saith it not, where place was to say it, if he had euer so ben: and S. Basile would gently haue acknowledged the same, specially whereas he made sute vnto him to take Scholars to teach sent out of Capadocia, at his request.

But what if it be graunted that S. Basile was Libanius scholar? Might not he at an other time be his schoolefellow? Though S. Basile were his scholar in Rhetorique, yet they might be Schoolefellows in Philosophie, and in the Mathematicals. were not some your scholars M. Jewel in Corpus Christi Colledge when you taught Rhetorique there, who were your Schoolefellows in Divinitie, when Peter Martyr came to Oxford? what so euer this Amphilocheus was, by this reason he is not disproued.

Coniectures
S. Basile
was neuer
Libanius
scholar in
his youth.

A Reioindre to

Ierrol.

Chc. 189. Nazianzene and Gregorius Presbyter saye, that Basile continu-
intruth. ing at Casarea, vvas well acquainted vwith Eusebius the Bishop there,
My Am. before he went into Pontus: * M. Hardinges Amphilocheius saith, that
philochi- at his returns from Pontus, vvhich vvas sone after, Eusebius knewe
us saith him not, neither had euer spoken vwith him or sene him before.
no such
thing.

Harding.

Of any great acquaintance that was between S. Basile
 and Eusebius before S. Basiles going into Pontus, neyther
 Gregorie Nazianzene, nor Gregorius Presbyter speake.
 Of enenitie between them they speake. And that you res-
 porte of my Amphilocheius, I assure you my booke hath no
 mention of it.

Ierrol.

Chc. 190. M. Hardinges Amphilocheius saith, Basile vvas Bishop of Cas-
intruth. rea, in the time of the Emperour Iulianus: vvherypon also are found-
Nazian- ded a great many sode fables, Nazianzene his nearest frende saith, he
zen saith vvas chosen Bishop there a long vvhile after, in the time of the Empe-
not this rour Valens, * and vvas not Bishop there at al during the vvhole time
much, as of Iulianus.
by f boke
it may be
tried.

Harding.

About the time when S. Basile was made Bishop, there
 may a varietie be espied in wryters without their greate discre-
 dite. For in the accompt of times, seldome do wryters ey-
 ther Hystorians, or Ecclesiastical thorowly agree. which
 appeareth evidently in the conference of the Greeke histo-
 rians with Titus Lilius in the reckening of the yeares,
 and specially in the booke of Councils. In Monodia Nazi-
 anzeni which Tolaterranus wrote, touching this mater, we
 finde these wordes, Itaq; non vt quidam existimant, Basilus
 sub Iuliano principe, sed post Valentis mortem Episcopus fait.

Basile.

Basile was not Bishop in the time of Julian the Emperour as some thinke, but after the death of Valens. By which wordes it appeareth that menues opinions herein haue ben diuerse. But for my selfe I beleue he was Bishop in the time of Valens. That he was not Bishop at al during the whole time of Julianus, though perchappes it be true, yet S. Gregorie Nazianzene expressly saith it not, as you repozte.

Iewel.

M. Hardings Amphilocheus saith, Basile foretold the death of Iulian: Theodoretus saith, it was one Iulianus Sabba, that *foretold it, *and not S. Basile.

Harding.

It might haue ben tolde by both. Albeit, Iulianus Sabba did not foretel his death, but tolde miraculously he was dead after that he was slaine. That S. Basile tolde it not, so much Theodoretus saith not. Diogenes also of Alexandria told it, having learned the same by a maruelous vision, as Sozomenus declareth.

Iewel.

M. Hardinges Amphilocheus saith the Emperour Valens yelded and gave place vnto Basile. Sozomenus saith, the Emperour continued stil his purpose, and would not yelde.

Harding.

Both S. Gregorie Nazianzene, and Theodoretus, and others that write of S. Basiles persecution, confesse that at length Valens yelded in some parte, and proceeded not so rigorously, as he had intended.

Iewel.

M. Hardinges Amphilocheus saith, Nazianzene was present at S. Basiles buriall. Nazianzene him selfe, that ought to knowe it best, *saith he came afterwarde, and was not present.

II. ij

Harding.

The. 191.
vnto trust.
Theodo-
ritus saith
not that
Iulius
Sabba
foretolde
Iulianus
death.
The. 192.
vnto trust.
That is
not in
Theodo-
ritus.
Theodorit.
lib. 2. c. 23.
Sozom lib
2. cap. 2.

Theodor.
lib. 2. c. 19.
Nazian-
in Mono-
dia.
The. 193.
vnto trust.
Nazianzen
saith not
so in
Mono-
dia.

A Reioindre to

Harding.

Whether he was at S. Basiles burial or no, I neither deny, nor affirme. That Nazianzene him selfe saith, he came afterward, and was not present: that I deny. For he saith no such thing at all, at least in Monodia, as you haue coted your Margent,

Ieruel.

The. 194.
In truth.
This is
not said by
this Am-
philochius.
It is
S. Jewels
false
addition.

Gregorius presbyter saith, Nazianzene came a great while after that Basile was buried. M. Hardinges Amphilocheus is so impudent, that he saith, Nazianzenus came in al haste, and saw the blessed bodie, and sel vpon it, when it was buried. Whereby it semeth, that this Amphilocheus was not very wise, nor circumspect in his talke. For if Nazianzene saw S. Basiles bodie, how was it buried? If it were buried, how could he see it?

Harding.

Gregorius presbyter saith, Quum multum effluxisset temporis. &c. a long time after that S. Basile was departed from this life to God, Gregorie Nazianzene wrote Epitaphium, an Oration in praise of him, which is extant in Greke, and then came to Caesarea, and there before the Titie pronounced it openly. This excludeth not, but that he might haue ben there before at his burial. But whether he were so or no, I say not. Only I note the febleness of S. Jewels reasons, and the vnttruthes of his sayings. Now saith he, this Amphilocheus is so impudent, as to say, that Nazianzene came in hast, saw, and sel vpon the blessed bodie, when it was buried. Now say he saith it not. These wordes, when it was buried, be of your own false addition, they be not in this Amphilocheus. wherefore he was not impudent, that wrote the not, but you were impudent that put them in, & with the same so slowly bely him. For al this he may seme wise & circumspect ynough in his talke, may you prone your self a false lyer in reponing him.

S. Jew.
by false ad-
dition cor-
rupteth &
falsifieth
place
which he
impug-
neth.

If you deale so falsly with my Amphiloehius, for so it liketh you to cal hi: you shal cause me to geue more credite vnto his autozitie, then I claime to be geuen. Thus I haue shewed y weaknesse of M. Jew. reasons which he bringeth to despyne this Amphiloehius, & the falshe of his reportes. As for Amphiloehius himselfe, be he as he is, I neither defend him, nor condemne him.

Ieyvel.

We may nowr the better beleue Homer, that Iuppiter with his Goddess yvente downe sometimes for his pleasure to banquet in Ethiopia. &c.

Harding.

It hath euer ben the manner of heretikes to scoffe at miracles, visions, and apparitions. S. Ambrose sheweth, that the Arians, after y one Senerus in Syllan, who had ben long blinde, miraculously recovered his sight at the touch of holy Martyrs reliques, would not beleue it, though it were most certainly known. As concerning visions, al seme ridiculous and foolish to some, saith S. Cyprian: sed vtique illis, qui malunt contra sacerdotes credere, quam sacerdoti. But they be such, saith he, as had rather beleue against the Priestes, then beleue a Priest.

But sy, you that compare the apparition of Chyriste with the poetical fiction of Iupiters coming downe into the earth, thinke you it to be a mater al together vaine, and so to be laughed at? Trowe you that holy me haue not sometimes for their comfort the benefite of such apparitions? wil you make Eggeppus, who was so nigh the Apostles time, & S. Ambrose, false fablers, who constantly report how Chyriste appeared vnto S. Peter, as he was flying from Rome for feare of death? wil you scoffe at the whole Church, in which the sounde of these wordes is oftentimes heard, Martinus Catechumenus hac me veste contextit.

Heretikes haue euer mocked visions, and miracles. Ambro. in Sermo. 91. Cyp. li. 4. epist. 9.

Of visions and apparitions made to holy men.

Chyriste appeared vnto S. Peter, as Eggeppus, & S. Ambrosius do reports.

A Rejoindre to

Christe Martine the Catechumen hath covered me with this garment: wil you scoffe at the learned Father Gregorius presbyter, whose autoritie you haue so much vsed in this article? If you discredite others, yet him I crowne you wil not refuse as a vaine fabler. Weade in him the life of S. Gregorie Nazianzen: and there you shal finde these very wordes. πολλὰκις γοῦν κὶ χεῖρον ὥρῃ ἐναργῶς ἐν ὕπνῳ, κὶ ἐν μελέτῃ νυκτερινῇ τὰ αὐτὴν τῇ καρδίᾳ παύσας καμύσαντες ἐκείδον. that is to say. Many times he sawe

The appa Christe manifestly in his sleape, and in his night meditation, receiuing this rewarde for his pure life. If S. Gregorie Nazianzen sawe Christe many times in some recompense as it were of his purenesse, why may we not thinke the same of S. Basile, who in al vertue & holinesse of life by report of al was rather passing, then inferior to Nazianzen?

Here could I say much for prouise, that it is neither an incredible, nor strange, nor vnwonted thing, Christe, his Mother the blessed virgin Marie, Angels, Apostles, and other Saintes, to appeare vnto men, and one liue man in a vision to appeare vnto an other liue man, as the holy mounte

Aug. de cu Iohannes appeared vnto a godly woman, wherof S. Augustine speaketh, and disputeth how it might be, in his booke **de cura pro mortuis agenda ad Paulinum**; and this would I hereto doe, but that it would aske a larger treatise then this Article requireth, and that I stay not much vpon this vision of

S. Basile set forth by this Amphilochius, what so euer he was. For in dede we haue no neede for prouise of the Masse, to allege visions. It is and may be otherwise sufficient-ly proued.

The xxiiij Division.

This is the last Division of this Article, in which I allege
for proufe of the Priestes sole receiuing at Masse, that M.

Jewel and his companions cal private Masse, a place of
S. Chrysostome out of the 61. homilie ad populum Antiochenum. *Chrys. ho. 61. ad pop. Antioche.*
where complayning of the peoples slacknesse in receiuing their
rightes, he saith, the Sacrifice is daily offered, the priestes stande
at the aukter, but nullus est qui communicetur, there is not one
(saith he) that wil be houseled. This place witnesseth with most
cleare wordes, that Masse was daily celebrated (for therein the
eternal Sacrifice of the Church, that is to say, the body and blood
of Christe is consecrated, offered, and receiued by the Priest) and
that none came to receiue with the Priest. And so is it founde,
that in S. Chrysostomes time long with in the terme of the first
fife hundred yeres, Masse was said and donne, though some
times the Priest had no companie to receiue the Communion in
the same place with him. This being proued, M. Jewel is duly
required to yelde and subscribe.

Against this, it stande you vpon M. Jewel, to replie with
reason, not to make your reader merry with scoffing. It is not
vniuersally known vnto you, that wynding vp of a matter, is by commo
vse of speech made an English terme. wherfore your teasing at
it toucheth not me so much as the language of your Countre.
Of Clew or twined thread; wherewith you make your selfe
pleasant, there was no mention. If you would nedes shew
that you had a feat grace in teasing, you should haue taken iust
occasion offered, and not byerde the occasion of the whole spoyle
your selfe. As one said once in Rome of a merry Consul;

A Reioindre to

quàm ridiculum habemus consulem? I see it may as wel be said of you, quàm ridiculum habemus Ecclesiasten, what a sporting preacher haue we? But let vs heare, what you say.

Ieruel.

Here vvould I first knowe, vvwhether M. Harding vvill rest vpon the bare vvordes of Chrysostome, or rather qualifie them somevvhat, and take his meaning. If he presse the vvordes precisely, as he semeith to doo, then did not Chrysostome him selfe communicate, for he vvvas some body: and the plaine vvordes be, no body doth communicate. By vvwhich vvordes doubtlesse Chrysostome him selfe is excluded, as vvvel as others. And so there vvvas no sole receiuing, nor any receiuing at al: and therefore no Priuate Masse.

Harding.

To satisfie your desire, I tel you for answere, that I will rest vpon the vvordes of S. Chrysostome, not bare, but taking also his meaning: which is to meane as he spake, and not contrary to his speech. Neither wil I the vvordes so precisely to be pressed, that S. Chrysostome him selfe by them should be made not to communicate. Such precisenes is besides al reason. And your selfe pardy are not so simple, but you knowe, that in an vniuersal speech, the common rule taketh place, semper excipitur persona loquentis. Alwaies the parry that speaketh is excepted: namely in such speeches as signifie an action not conching the speaker him selfe. As here, S. Chrysostom saying, that there was none to communicate, spake it of the communicating of others with him, not of his owne receiuing of the Sacrifice which he had consecrated. Now you come to dispute vpon S. Chrysostomes meaning, and that by a gheasse of your owne vtterly vttrue, as here it shal appeare.

Ieruel.

It appeareth Chrysostomes purpose vvvas, to rebuke the negligence of the people for that of so populous a Citie they came to the holy communion

in so smal companies. Which companies he in a vehemencie of speache by an exaggeration in respect of the whole, calleth no body. The like manner of speache is vsed also sometimes in the scriptures. S. Iohn saith of Christe, Testimonium eius nemo accipit, & c.

Harding.

You tel vs two thinges. The one, that S. Chrysostomes purpose was to rebuke the negligence of the people, for that they came to the Communion in smal companies. The other, that in a vehemencie of speache he calleth a smal companie by a comparison to the whole, no body. The one you proue not, towards the other you say somewhat, though to litle purpose. Touching the first, you say, it appeareth: And I say, it appeareth not. whether is moore to be belieued, your pea, or my nay? If it appeare, as you say, then tel vs whereof it appeareth: which be the wordes that shewe it? If you haue no such wordes in S. Chrysostome, I may seme to shew it, the how doth it appeare? Or will you say, it appeareth to you, when no man els can see it besides your selfe?

Clearly it is cleare, that S. Chrysostomes purpose was, not to rebuke the negligence of the people for coming to the Communion in smal companies, as you beare vs in hande: but to withdrawe them from their euill custome of receiuing their rites once in the yere, which was at Easter, and that though they were not duly and worthily prepared thereto, and to perswade them to receiue oftner. So to understand him, I considerance of the place, and his owne wordes do leade vs, whereof this saying, there is none that will be houseled, doth immediately depende & folow. First (saith he) great inequalitye of thinges among you. At other times when as for the most parte ye are in cleanness, ye come not to receiue your rites: But at Easter, though ye haue done somewhat amisse, yet ye come. O what a custome is this: O what a presumption is this? The daily Sacrifice is offered in vaine, we stand at the

what was
S. Chry-
stomes
purpose.

James B

Chryso-
Hom. 61.
ad pop.
Antio-
chen.

alter for adought, there is not one that wilbe houseled. what man
of any indgement is there, to whom these wordes of S. Chrys-
ostome do not plainly report, what was his purpose in this
sharpnes of speache? who seeth not how he rebuketh them for
that they forbearing to receiue at other times, when they were in
cleane life, they would receiue at Easter, yea though somewhat
were amisse? wherein they folowed more the common custome at
that time vbled, the considered vprightly, what the dutie of Chry-
stian people required. This he calleth inequality of thinges,
this he calleth presumption. As in deede howe diueren dea-
ling is it, a man to forbear the enioying of that great benefite,
when he mighte worthely receiue it, and for customes sake to
come hnto it, when he is vnworthy of it? to shunne it when it
geneth life, and to take it, when it procureth damnation? And
what a grend presumption is it, a man to come to that holy table
of the high kinge, not hauing on him his wedding garment?
This inequality of thinges, this presumption, and peruersi-
tie of custome, is that against which S. Chrysostomes special
purpose was to speake.

Inequali-
tie of
thinges.

Presump-
tion.

Custome.

Presump-
tion.

Chrys-
ostome.

Rebuke.

Communion.

If his mynde had ben to rebuke the negligence of the
people, for that they came to the Communion in smal compa-
nies, that is to say, because the more parte of the refrayned from
commung hnto it, he would not haue called it a custome, nor
a presumption. For custome hath his name of a thing often-
times and usually donne, and not of that a thing is omitted and
not donne. Presumption likewise is of a thing donne rash-
ly, vnreuerently, and vnworthily, which requirerh great re-
uerence feare, and honour, and is not so called, when a thing
is lesse vndonne. Againe if his purpose had ben to rebuke
them for their coming to the Communion in smal compa-
nies, then as he would haue commended some for that they
came.

came, so he would have blamed others, for that they came not.

And whereas you bring an example of a like phrase out of the Scripture, and also out of S. Chrysostome, in which a few are to be understood, though Nemo be expressed, it is to no purpose, unless you could prove, that S. Chrysostome found fault with the fewness of the Communicantes, and not with the evil customs of receiving the Communion at Easter once, though they were not in worthy sort disposed. For what if in S. John Nemo significat few, where it is said, Testimonium eius nemo accipit, wil it follow therof that in this place also it must so signifie? Remember you not that examples serve to make cleare that is obscure, and not also to prove that is denied? Have you forgotten the old saying, Exemplarem ostendunt, non probant? First you should have shewed, that in this very place Nemo is taken for small companies, and then you might wel have declared by other like examples of the Scriptures and Doctours, that the wordes do importe that signification were not a thing brutish and strange, wherefore seeing that (as it is now declared) S. Chrysostomes wordes containe a rebuke not of the peoples coming to the Communion in small companies, but of their ungodly dealing, and of their ungodly custome, in that they forbore to receive the Communion at other times when their life was pure, and presumed to receive at Easter, how impure souer they were: and seeing there appeareth nothing whereby the daily receiving of other Priests and Deacons with the Priest that daily celebrated the Sacrifice is clearely proved: I say still, that this place of S. Chrysostome witnesseth the Priests standing at the altar, and the oblation of the Sacrifice, when none others communicated sacramentally with him, which is that the Evangelist private Masse,

John. 3.

A Reioindre to

And albeit, this onely answer compared with the manner of Chrysostomes eloquence, which commonly is heate and seruent, and with the common practise of the Churcherben, may suffice a man more desirous of truth, then of contention, yet I haue good hope, it may be proued, not withstanding M. Hardinges Nemo, that Chrysostome neither was alone, nor could be alone at the holy Ministration, and therefore could say no private Masse.

Harding.

You do wel and wisely to geue ouer your holbe, and not to stand vnto your former Answer. Let it be graunted, that oftentimes S. Chrysostome speaketh in great heate against those, whose eares and hartes the custome of synne hath dulled, as becommeth a preacher to speake: will you therefore charge him with an intrud in this place, as making smal companies to be nobody? But he useth the like speech in an other homilie, and the Scripture speaketh likewise sometimes. Yet if you could allege a hundred such phrases, al they would not proue your conceived meaning of this place. As concerning the practise of the Churcherben, though very commonly some others wel disposed of the people, or of the Clergie receiued with the Priest that sacrificed: yet that proueth not, but sometimes the Priest might receiue that he had offered alone, whercof S. Chrysostome here complaineth, not that they of Antioch came to the Communion in smal companies, but that many times they came not at al, for that is it he meaneth by his word οὐδ' οὐς, that is to say, nullus, none.

But what is the good hope you haue conceived? Marry that it may be proued (say you) notwithstanding M. Hardinges Nemo, that S. Chrysostome neither was alone, nor could

could be alone at the holy Ministration, and therefore could say no private Masse. What bring you the matter now from receiving alone, to being alone? who spake of the Priestles being alone? Is not our question of the Priestles sole receiving? why speake you of S. Chrysostomes not being alone?

Ieruel.

For if the whole companie of the lay people wold haue forsaken him, yet had he companie sufficient of the Priestles and Deacons, and others of the Quire. And if the whole Quire woulde haue forsaken him, yet had he companie sufficient of the lay people: as it may be clearly proued.

Harding.

What nede is there to proue that no man denyeth? what if S. Chrysostome were not forsaken so of al companie, but that some or other were present, when so euer he said Masse? wil you thereof conclude, that he neuer said private Masse, as much to say, that at his Masse he neuer receined the Communion alone? For that is it you vnderstand by a private Masse, how so euer you tangle here. He saith not, I am destitute of companie, or that, no body is present at the celebration of the holy Mysteries, but, οὐδὲς ὁ μὲν ἵχων, nullus est qui participet, there is none to receiue with me. Your parte had ben substantially to proue, that S. Chrysostome & al other Priestles had euermore companies to receiue with them, when so euer they celebrated the daily Sacrifice, or that they forebare to do it for lacke of companies to be partakers of the Mysteries with them. Not being hable to proue this, you thought it best to proue an other matter, that no mā doubteth of and which is easy to be proued. Then thus you make your entrie into an vnnecessary, idle, & impertinent Common place.

Ieruel.

That there was then a greates number to serue in the Ministerie, it

ZZ is may

A Reioindre to

Ignat. ad Trallian. may diuersly well appeare. Ignatius calleth Presbyterium, the sacred Colledge, the Councel and companie of the Bishop.

Harding.

who denieth, but that the Bishop had of olde time a companie about him in his Church? So is it now in euery Bishops See, or Cathedral Church. But this proueth not that alwaies they communicated sacramentally with him, when so euer he said Masse.

Jewel.

Chrysostome him selfe in his Liturgie saith thus. The Deacons bring the dishes with the holy bread vnto the holy Altar, the rest carrie the holy Cuppes. By which wordes appeareth bothe a number of the Ministerie, and also prouision for them that would receiue.

Harding.

At certaine times the people receiued the Communion, it is not denyed. At such times the Deacons in seemly wise brought breade, and wine vnto the Altar to be consecrated. Neither is it denied, though this place proued it not, that Churches of olde time had Deacons and other Ministers in holy Orders, and that some prouision of bread and wine was made for them that receiued then the body and blood of Christe vnder the formes of Bread & wine, as we see now prouision of Breade made at Easter and other feastes, when faithful and deuoute people be disposed to receiue their maker vnder the forme of bread. But that there was no Masse, or Sacrifice celebrated, in which such order was not taken for a companie of communicantes: that (say wee) by s. Chrysostomes Liturgie here alleged, not by any other place that Mr. Jewel can bring, is yet proued.

Jewel.

Epist. Cornelij ad

Fab. ex Eu

seb. lib. 6.

cap. 23.

Cornelius writeth, that in the Church of Rome, there were fourty and sixe Priests, seuē Deacons, seue Subdeacons, fourty and tyeo Acouters, Exorcists,

Pres, Readers and other officers of the Church, fiftie and two: Widowes, and other afflicted people that there were releued, a thousand five hundred. Nazianzen complaineth of the number of the Clergie in his time, that they seemed to be more then the rest of the people. And therefore the Emperour Iustinian after ward, thought it needful to abridge the number, and to make a law, that in the great Church of Constantinople, where Chrysostome was Bishop, there should not be above the number of threescore Priests, one hundred Deacons, forty women, foure score and ten Subdeacons, one hundred and ten Readers, and five and twenty Singers.

Nazian.
in Apol-
getico.
In authet.
col. i. Tit.
vt determi-
uatis.

Harding.

Truth it is, there was a great companie of Clerkes, widowes, and other afflicted people in the time of S. Cornelius that blessed Pope and Martyr, belonging to the Church of Rome. What conclude you thereof? Because at those daies the Church had so many, will it follow thereof, that they did alwaies receiue the Communion; when any Priest there offered the Sacrifice? We strue not with you for the presence of a companie, but we requirer you to proue, that the Mysteries were neuer celebrated, or to speake as now we speake, the Masse was neuer said; but when a companie receiued with the Priest. This place as it moueth not so much, so it sheweth manifestly how farre vnlke your new Congregation is to the Church of that time; what difference there is betwix your Clergie & thes Clergie, and how the Church then had the same degrees of holy Orders, that the Catholique Church hath at this day.

In that Epistle of S. Cornelius to Fabianus Bishop of Antioche we finde the seven Orders that in holy Church are generally named, which are these. Priests, Deacons, Subdeacons, Acolutes, Exorcistes, Readers, Porters or waiters at the Church dores, which worde you couered with your false

A Reioindre to

29. Jew.
falsifieth
S. Cornelius
epistle.

translation of other Officers of the Church, contrary to the Breke, where you found these two wordes, *ἄμα πύλοισι*, & is, vñ cum hostiariis, least you should put the Reader in mynde of the iust number of the holy Orders of the Church, which the Church of your new Gospel utterly contemneth, the Clergie whereof consisteth in manner al together of craftesmen whom after your owne deuise ye dubbe Ministers. That you allege of Nazianzene and Iustinian, proueth nothing, but that at that time the Clergy was great. It were good you would stand vpon the point, and leaue such needlesse vagaries. Now let vs vnderstand of al this what conclusion you inferre.

Iewel.

Herby vve may see, that Chrysostome being at Antioche in so populous a Citie, although he had none of the Lay people with him, yet could not be left alone.

Harding.

Is this the conclusion, whereunto you drine al that you haue alleged hitherto, that S. Chrysostome could not be alone? And how is that concluded? By witness of S. Cornelius the number of the Clergie in his time was great at Rome, so was it also in other places by reporte of S. Gregorie Nazianzene. The Emperour also Iustinian abridged the number of the Clergie of Constantinople: what foloweth of al this, Ergo S. Chrysostome in the populous Citie of Antioche could not be left alone? what meane you M. Iewel, could he not be left alone at Antioch, because there were many Clerkes in the Church of Rome, and of Constantinople? what reason is this? where is your Logicke? where is the sharpnesse of your witte? Although your argument in this place be absurd & foolish, yet if we graunte it, what proue you thereby, but onely y there was a companie present? But when will you shrowe vs by any point of learning, that a
Bpistle

priest might not Consecrate and offer the Sacrifice, except a companie receiued it with him? why doth he not allege S. Chrysostome, S. Augustine, S. Hierome, S. Ambrose, S. Basile, or some one of al the holy and learned Fathers, that wrote from the Apostles time vntil M. Luther blasted abroad this new Gospel, who affirmeth plainely, that Masse can not be said, or that the vnbloudy and external Sacrifice of the Church can not be celebrated, onlesse a companie receiue with the priest in the same place? If the priest may not lawfully receiue alone, why doth he not allege one Father or one learned man olde or new, that is Catholike, who saith so? why doth he not shewe vs, where complaint was made by any Father, of the ceasing of the Daily Sacrifice for lacke of Communicantes? This were directly to the purpose. And men that take vpon them to defende any new Doctrine, and to impugne the olde so generally receiued, and so continually mainteined, as the Doctrine of the Church concerning the Masse is, ought to shewe cleare and euident reasons, and such as could with no learning and contrary reason be disprooued.

Ieruel.

Now if vve say, that some of the priestes, Deacons, or other communicated vwith the Bishop, I tel them (saith M. Harding) boldly and vwith a solemnne countenance, vvhich must nede make good proufe, this is but a poore shifte, and vvil not serue their purpose.

Harding.

How so euer it becommeth a Superintendent to scoone and shuffe at my countenance, I tel you now againe no lesse boldly, then I tolde you before, that such answere is but a poore shifte in dede, and wll not fully serue your purpose. Yet to say the truth, here you helpe me. For I said not I tel them, which might be wel said: but we tel them, and that for modesties sake, forselcing

AAA 4

as

A Reioindre to

Page 31.

as it were, with what an Dickescorner I had to doe. But lying I trow to this fellow, is accidens inseparabile. Neither yet did I onely say so, but I added also a reason wherefoze. which reason you haue craftily dissembled, because you can not answer it. Now let vs see what shifte you can make, that your answer pretending a sufficient companie of priestes and Deacons to receiue with euery priest that in any place saith Masse beside Cathedral Churches, seme not to be a pooze shifte. Thus you say.

Ieruel.

But if it be true, it is rich ynough. If it agree with Chrysostomes owne meaning, it is no shifte, and therefore sufficiently serueth our purpose.

Harding.

Prooue it to be true, then it shalbe rich ynough. Prooue it to agree with S. Chrysostomes meaning, then it shalbe no shifte.

Ieruel.

And because he sitteth so fast vpon the bare wordes, and repositeth al his hope in Nemo, if we liste to cauil in like sorte, we might soone finde warrant sufficient to answer this mater, euen in the very plaine wordes of Chrysostome. For thus they lie. Frustra alsistimus altari, in vaine we stande at the aulter. We stande saith he, and not I stande; and therefore includeth a number, and not one alone.

Harding.

To presse the Doctors wordes with his meaning, that is not to cauil. To wrest the Doctour to that he neuer meant, as you do, making him say one thing, and meane an other, that in dede is to cauil. It is very vaine, that you claime aduantage of the plural number, because he saith, we stande, and not I stande. As though he spake it not both of himselfe, and of many

Aduantage
claimed of
the plural
number.
We stand.

many other Bishops, that did the like, who in their severall churches tooke oftentimes at the Altare, and celebrated the Sacrifice, when they had no companie to receive with them. S. Paule (you knowe) very oftentimes speaketh in the plural number, when he meaneth him selfe, and others, that attended the business of the Apostleship, though they were farre a sundrie: as (for example) where he saith, *Habemus thesaurum istum in vas fictilibus*. We have this treasure in earthen vessels. So S. Chrysostome, *Ve stande*, saith he, that is, I and others that be likewise priests, stande at the Altare, we offer the Daily Sacrifice, and yet, *Nullus qui communicetur, there is nor one that doth Communicate*.

If you wil needes have, this worde of the plural number *assistimus*, we stande, to comprehend a number of others that tooke with S. Chrysostome at the altare: yet that proueth not, that they received, onlesse you make vs beleue, that to stand at the Altare is to receive. Merely I marvel, how you dare stand so long vpon this place, in which you see so manifest a Testimonie for Altars, which wickedlye ye have throwen downe, and for the Daily Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christe, which like Antichristes forerunners ye have abolished.

Testimonie for altars, and for the daily sacrifice

Ierrell.

It is provided by the Canons of the Apostles, that if any Bishop, or Priest, or Deacon, or any other of the Quiere, after the Oblation is made, do not receive, onlesse he shew some reasonable cause of his so doing, that he stand excommunicate. The like lawe in the Church of Rome was afterwards renewed by Pope Anacletus.

Can. Apo. ca. 9.
ἐκ τῶν κληρικών
τοῦ ἱεροῦ
τοῦ κληρικού.

Harding.

If by your false Translation, you make them to be of the Quiere, which by the Canons of the Apostles be

False translation.

A Reioindre to

Canon. A. ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ λόγους τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ: the who so euer hath married a wi-
post. ca. 17. dow, a harlot, or a house maid, he can not be a Bishop, nor Priest,
οὐκ ἔτι nor Deacon, no neither so much as of the Quiere, For so saith
the xvij. Canon of the Apostles Canons, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ κατὰ λόγους
τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ. If you stand to your translation, and to those Ca-
nons, where wil you place your false named Bishops, Priests,
and Deacons, which haue married widowes, I wil not say which
haue yoked them selues vnto harlottes?

But touching the Canons of the Apostles, they bound them
onely that were of that first age. After that the number of Chri-
stian people was increased, the great rigour of them was remit-
ted. Neither were al faithful persons that came to the common
place of prayer, stil bound to receiue the Communion after the
Oblation was made, vnder the paine of excommunication, as it
is decreed by those Canons. For at length it was decreed by S.

Canon. A. Fabian the Pope, that men should not be bound to Communi-
post. ca. 10. cate oftener then thise in the yeare, at Christmasse, Easter, and
De cons. wissonday. The like Decree was made touching the Laie peo-
dist. 1. & si ple, in the Councel of Agatha. wherefore the Canons of the
non. Apostles were no necessarie Lawe nor rule of the Church in S.
Cuncil. A. Chrysostomes time. Yet by those Canons also as hard as they
gathen. were, they of the Clergie vpon a reasonable cause, sometimes
ca. 18. were excused for not receiuing the Communion, when the Ob-
lation was made.

Anaclet. As for the Decree of Anacletus that you speake of, it is to be
epist. 1. vnderstanded onely of those, that attended vpon the Bishop at
the celebration of the Sacrifice, and that onely vpon solempne
feastes, as I haue before declared.

Ieruel.

Council. Ni- The Councel of Nice decreeth thus. Accipiant Diaconi secun-
cen. ca. 14. dum ordinem post presbyteros ab Episcopis, vel a Presbytero
Communionio.

Communionem. Let the Deacons in order after the priestes receiue of the Bishops, or of the priest the holy Communion.

Harding.

This sheweth onely in what order the Deacons should receiue the Communion, it containeth not a commaundement binding them at euery Oblation to receiue. How be it you haue partially and vnruly alleged the wordes of this Decree, by taking parte for your purpose, and leaning out parte which maketh against you, and by which the whole may the better be vnderstanded. That Decree of the Nicene Councel truly alleged, hath thus. It is reported vnto the holy Councel, that in certain places; and cities, the Deacons do geue the Sacramentes vnto priestes. But this neither rule, neither custome hath delyuered vnto vs, that they who haue not power to offer the Sacrifice, should geue the Sacramentes vnto them that offer. (where this much is to be noted by the way, that by the most auncient and allowed Councel of Nice, the Oblation of the Sacrifice, and of such a Sacrifice as none haue power to offer but priestes, is a- uouchd. It foloweth.) But this hath come vnto our knowledge, that certaine Deacons receiue the Sacramentes before the Bishops. Let al these thinges therfore be cut away, and let them receiue the holy Communion in order after the priestes, of the Bishop, or of a priest. In case there be no Bishop nor priest present, then let the Deacons bring it forth and eate it. By which wordes reseruatiō is proued, and that of one kinde, as reason geureth. For neither can wine be long kept; neither thereto would the Fathers of that Councel haue sayd, edant, let them eate: but edant & bibant, let them eate it, and drinke it, if they had meant both. As this Decree then proueth not that at euery Masse Deacons ought of necessity to receiue the Sacrament, so it geureth vs a manifest witnesse of the Oblation of the Sacri-

ad. Iew.
corrupteth
the Nicene
Councel,
by heaving
and mang-
ling.

Reseruati
on is pro-
ued by this
canon of
the Nicene
Councel,
and that of
one kinde,
as it apa-
peareth.
witness
of oblatio.

¶¶¶ it.

fice,

A Reioindre to

sice, which is donne in the Masse, and of Reservation, and that (as it appeareth) vnder one kinde. And so the Council of Nice proueth the Catholike Doctrine, it proueth nothing for you. But let vs heare more of your proues, that S. Chrysostome could not say private Masse, and receiue alone, for that you haue taken in hande to proue.

Ieruel.

Concil.

Carthag.

6. Ca. 18.

Concil.

Laodicē.

Ca. 59.

Concil.

Toletan.

4. Ca. 17.

Likevise in the Council of Carthage, Accipiant Diaconi, ex ordine Eucharistiam post Presbyteros, eis dante Episcopo, vel Presbytero. Let the Deacons receiue the Communion in order after the priestes, either the Bishop or the priest ministring it. So the Council of Laodicea, It is lawfull onely for the priestes of the Church to enter into the place, where the altare standeth, and there to Communicate. So the Council of Toledo, Let the priestes and Deacons Communicate before the Altare, the clerkes in the Quire, and the people without the Quire.

Harding.

To these Councils I answer as before. There is declared an order how the Deacons should receiue, there is no commendement geuen, when and how often they should receiue. Againe it is to be noted, that these Councils, specially the two former, speake of the manner and custome of the Churches, in which the bishops offered the Sacrifice, who in solenne feastes, when they celebrated, had certaine priestes and Deacons about them, who also Communicated with them, according to S. Aracletus Decree. It was not so in other places, where there was not such number of Bishopps and Deacons. For to beleue that such lacke was in some places, we are perswaded by the Decree of S. Soter: who ordeined that when a priest celebrateth Masse, he haue an other priest by him to supply his Office, if any suddaine infirmitie happen. But where? in euery place? No, but ubi clerici copia suffragatur, that is as much to say, where there is such a number

De Con.
dist. 1. vt
illud.

number of Priestes, that if one fall sicke, an other maye be present to performe that is to be done. which had ben absurd so to haue said, onlesse in some certaine places, there had ben but one priest.

Againe the Decrees of these prouincial Councils binde not generally. For els no priest might go to Church before the bishop go. For so it is Decreed by the Council of Laodicea here mentioned. And so where there is no bishop, there should no priest come to Church. And so it was not to be alleged against private Masse.

Concil.
Laodic.
Ca 56.

Itvel.

Nicolaus Cusanu writing vnto the Clergie and learned of Bohemia, hath these wordes: Hoc est singulariter attendendum, quod Sacerdotes nunquam sine Diacono celebrabant: & in omni Missa Diaconus de manu sacerdotis accepit Eucharistiam sub specie Panis, & Sacerdos de manu Diaconi Calicem. This thing is specially to be noted, that the priest did neuer celebrate without a Deacon: and that in every Masse the Deacon receiued the Sacrament in the kinde of bread, at the priestes hande: and the priest the cuppe at the Deacons hande.

Nic. Cusanus ad Cerum & literatos Bohemias.

Harding.

This place is of small authoritie. First I finde it farre otherwise reported in the booke that was printed at Basile euen among the of your own sect. View the place who will in the print of Henricus Petri, Anno. M.D.XLV. and he shal finde it altogether otherwise then you haue alleged. It is to be sene Pagina 834. in his paginae. Againe though it were as you reherse the wordes, yet is Nicolaus Cusanus a late writer. He liued about a C. yeres past. If you would sse to his iudgement touching not only this Article of the Masse, but also al other your Articles, in which you and your felowes vary from the Catholike Church: we would sone say vnto you, ye are welcome home, In that

Cusanus epist. 7. ad Bohemos.

A Reioindre to

Cusanus
epist. 7. ad
Bohemos.

very Epistle, yea in this very place he proueth Communion vnder one kinde against the Iacobellians. If you folowe his autoprity in that, you may be the bolder to require vs to heare him in this. If you condemne him in that, and in a number of other Articles: what reason is it, you should bynde vs to stand to his autoprity in this? And make the best you can of this place, yet by it you can not proue a Communion lawfull by your owne tradition: for you teach that it is not a sufficient Communion, except there be three that receiue with the priest at least. But what so euer he say, that is beside that the Church obserueth generally, concerning certaine olde customes: we wil so farre beleue him, as he proueth it. If he proue it not, we may reasonably suspende our assent, vntill you or some other proue it for him. whereas you exclude vs from alleging al that wrote without the first sixe hundred yeres, it is not euen dealing you should be admitted to take your aduantage of euery thing that is without prouise reported by al that euer wrote sithens the Apostles time to this present age.

Answer to
the place
of Cusanus.

Yet least you should craue of the force of this place alleged out of Cusanus, I answer, that it is to be vnderstanded onely of the custome of Cathedral Churches, where priestes had alwaies Deacons attending vpon them at the holy Oblation, and of those Masses, which were celebrated with solemnity in the high and principal Feastes. which manner disproueth not but that in Diatopies and other Churches, where such number of clergie was not still resident, Masse might vpon necessity be said, to re- coide the memorie of our Lordes death, without any such seruice of a Deacon at al. Example whereof I alleged here before out of Leontrius wyting of the Masse, which the blessed man S. John surnamed the Merciful Patriarche of Alexandria celebra- red in his Diatopie.

Ieruel.

Iewel.

Chrysostome him selfe in the Liturgie, that commonly beareth his name. followeth the same order. After that the Priestes have receiued (saith he) the Archdeacon commaundeth the deacons to come forth; and they so coming vnto him, as the Priestes did before. This was the very order of Chrysostomes Masse, touching the Clergie; and that by Chrysostome him selfe.

Harding.

This witnesseth, they did so in the Cathedral or metropolitane Church in Constantinople at solemne feastes, when the Bishop him selfe did celebrate a solemne Masse; when the Archdeacon attended vpon him, & gaue order what the inferiour Deacons should doo. But that this was donne at all times, and in all places when soeuer and where soeuer the Masse was said, and that they were bounde thus to doe, (whereby S. Chrysostome could at no time possibly receive the Communion alone no not when he was a priuate Priest at Antioche); this much by the wordes of the Liturgie can not be proued. Had euery Parrish Church and Chappel within the large Diocesse of Constantinople an Archdeacon? If it had not, and if the Archdeacon were attending vpon the Bishop, or some other Priest, that did the Bishops sede: this place can not be alleged, as to declare what was the order in euery Church, where Masse was said, but what was the order in the Cathedral Church.

How be it these wordes be not at all in S. Chrysostomes Greke Liturgie, nor in the translation of Erasmus, & is nearest vnto the Greke. But they are the words only of the Rubric of a Greke Masse booke, which one Leo Iulius in the time of Emanuel Emperour of Constantinople turned into Latine. Emanuel that Jewell would allege S. Chrysostomes Liturgie or Masse, seeing that he refused it before, and would not stand to it. Thus he saith, and vsaith, alloweth and condemneth, what

M. Jew.
now see-
helt helpe
at S. Chry-
stomes
Masse booke
i.e. whose
Masse be-
fore he re-
fused for
witness of the
same

A Reioindre to

him self for better shifting of the matter, that is presently handled.

If I should followe him herein, and take for myne advantage what so ever seemeth to serve on our side, I could out of this very place, where he founde these wordes concerning the receiving of the deacons with the priest, allege the wordes put immediately before, that seeme to make a cleare proufe of the private Masse.

In appo-
sunt testi-
monie for
private
Masse in
S. Chrys-
ostomes
liturgie.

For there it is said thus. Deinde Sacerdos sumit corpus Domini-
nicum, si solus fuerit. After that the Priest receiveth our lordes
body, if he be alone. If he be alone at the altar, & receive alone, the
hath he donne the, which these men call private Masse. And so far is
private Masse proved by S. Chrysostome him self. But whether
the deacons, or the people receive afterward or no: the Oblation is
made, & sacrifice is perfectly done, & so the Masse is done, by what
name so ever it be called, neither can the which is afterward done,
alter the nature & addition of that was before done. So whether
any others receive with the priest or no, yet that which the priest
hath donne is the Masse. And as if others receive, that maketh
not the Sacrifice publique or common, so if they receive not, that
maketh it not private. For in depe, as I have before said, there
is no Masse private in respect of the Sacrifice that is offered, of
which specially it is named. That M. Jewel calleth private
Masse, is none other but the priestes private receiving.

Jerrel.

Now let M. Harding iudge uprightly, whether these shiftes be so
poore as he would make them.

Harding.

I iudged these to be but poore shiftes before. Now againe the
more I weigh & consider the poore I iudge them. And al-
tho I be learned and can iudge, yea M. Jewel him selfe (if he can
iudge uprightly of ought that maketh against him) I doubt not,
will iudge the same. His cause had he thus to bragge,

But:

But here I must require the Reader to take ſome paines to read, what I haue ſaid in this place of my booke. which if he do, he may ſoone perceiue, what is that I cal a pooze ſiſtre, & for what cauſe I cal it ſo. And thus it is. whereas to auoide this place of C. Chyſoſtome, ſaying there was none ſhould be houſeled, when the daily Sacrifice was offered, if the Popellers by way of gheaffe would ſay, ſhould the Prieſtes & deacons communicated daily with him ſhould offered, though none of the people did: then we tel them ſay I (& not I tel the as M. Jewel ſaithly repoſeth ſ place) ſhould this pooze ſiſtre will not ſerue theſe purpoſe. And there I ſhew good cauſe why. For ſay I though they ſay ſhould in the great Church of Antioche ſome ſufficient number alwaies communicated with ſhould Prieſt that ſaid Maſſe, where many Prieſtes & deacons were, which neither being denied they ſhould neuer be able to proue: what may be thought of many thouſand other Churches abroad in the world, where ſhould Prieſt ſhould celebrated Maſſe, had not alwaies in readineſſe a ſufficient number of other Prieſtes & deacons to receiue with him, and ſo to make vp a full Communion? Of ſuch Churches it muſt be ſaid, that there either the Sacrifice ceaſed, and that was not donne, which Chriſte commaunded to be donne in his remembrance, which is not to be graunted: or that the memorie of our lords death was oftentimes celebrated of ſhould Prieſtes without taking for others to communicate with the, & ſo had theſe Churches private Maſſe, as the Churches now aduaies haue. Thus there.

For this cauſe I cal that ſurmiſed anſwere a pooze ſiſtre, as I might right wel doo. For by it the force of the obiection is not taken away. This much could M. Jewel caſtily diſſeale, & paſſe over to ſilence, & breake a long proceſſe for prouſe ſhould the clergy alwaies receiued with S. Chyſoſtome. Neither that can be proue ſufficiently, and though he could, yet my reaſon remaineth vniuerſally answered. For if he had cauſe to complaine of lacke of Commu-

A Reioindre to

nicaenes at Antioch, how much more cause had the Bishops of other lesser Churches to complaine thereof?

At length *St. Iewel* seeing him selfe not yet to haue proued sufficiently, that the Clergy of bounden duetie receiued the Communion alwaies, where so euer a Bishop said Masse, he turneth his tale, and speaketh of the people, and would his reader to beleue, that there was at euery Oblation of the Sacrifice a number of the people receiuing with the priest, wherby it might follow that *S. Chrysostome* could not receiue alone, when he said Masse.

Iewel.

Chrysostome in diuerse places semeth to diuide the vvhole multitude into three sortes, vvhich of some vvers Penitent, some Negligent, and some Deuoute.

Harding.

St. Chrysostome haue in diuerse places made such a diuision of y^e whole people into these thre sorts, as you say, you should haue done wel for your credites sake, to haue directed vs by your quotations (of which in matters of smal weight you are not spareful) to some of those places, that by conference we might see whether you dealt plainly or no. Now your other dealings be euery where found so vnttrue, that for good cause you be suspected. Yet to saue your credite, for so much as this is but your vncertaine gheasse, you do wel to say, *Chrysostome* semeth to diuide. Such doubtful seeming maketh smal proufe. whether he euer so diuided the people or no, I know not, certaine it is, y^e of them som did their open penance, who were named Penitentes, some were Negligent, & some were Deuoute, as of men some be white, some be blacke, and some be browne. Many such diuisions may soone be made. But to what ende bring you this exhortation?

Iewel.

Iewel.

The Penitent were commended away, and might not communicate. The Negligent sometime departed of them selves, and would not communicate. The Devoute remained, and received together.

Harding.

That such as were enioyned publique penance were not admitted to receive the Communion, it can not be denied. What you say of the Negligent, it is your owne, neither maketh it matter greatly, what you say of them. They that departed of themselves, and would not presume to receive, because they fealt some secret grudge in conscience, for that they are not to be reputed for negligent, but rather for reuerent, and such as feared God. And so might they be deuoute, though they departed, and received not. But the Devoute say you remained, and received together. Thus you say, but you proue it not. And though you were able to proue, they did so sometimes, which is not to be denied: yet if they omitted to receive at certaine times, then is this waste waste confessed. So that now your part was to proue, that at euery Masse the Devoute received, and that there was neuer any Masse for the first six hundred yeares, but a Devoute company received the Communion at it, which you shal neuer be able to proue.

Iewel.

Now that the Devoute remained still, with Chrysostome the whole time of the holy Mysteries, it is plaine by the very same place, that M. Harding here allegeth for his purpose.

Harding.

Here you trouble much to proue that the Devoute remained at the holy Mysteries. I pray you Sir, who denied it? If no man denied it, what meane you to dwell so long in it? Be it graunted you, they remained, how proue you that they received?

B B b ii.

wanders

reander not abroad, come close to the point, bring yegent reasons, bring not your uncertaine gheasses. Thus you would seme to proue it.

Scryel.

Ad popul. For thus Chrysostome saith vnto the people, Thou art come into the Antiochen Churche, and hast song praises vnto God with the rest, and hast
hom. 61. confessed thee selfe to be one of the worthy in that thou departedst not forth with the vnworthy. By these vwoordes he sheweth that some were worthy, and some vnworthy: that the vnworthy departed, and the worthy remained.

Harding.

In the Apostles age and long after, during the time of persecution, the deuoute and holy people remained at the celebration of the mysteries, and receiued. In proceesse of time, and after that peace was procured to the Churche through that the Emperours became Christians, which came to passe long before S. Chrysostomes time: the peoples deuotion slacked, and though they came to the Churche, and were present at the sacrifice, yet for the more parte they receiued not: and in the East Churche it was growen vnto a custome, that commonly they receiued but at Easter onely, and that though they were not then best prepared, which is the thing that S. Chrysostome complaineth of. They that remained, shewed them selues outwardly as though they were worthy. But their remaining is no necessary Argument of their receiuing. For euen in that Homilie the contrary is auouched immediately vpon the wordes by M. Jewel alleged.

Homil. eadem. Quomodo mansisti, neq; participas de mensa? How hast thou tannippeth
S. Chrysostom. ried (saith he) and doest not partake of the table? which M. Jewel craftily and falsly nipped away from the sentence, because he saw they made cleare against him. Such sinceritie is in these sincere Gospellers. Now then for al that he hath brought hitherto,

thereto, he concludeth no more but that the people remained at the holy Mysteries, that they received at every celebration, he is not able to conclude. And so there was Masse, when y^e people received not. Of al this directly he can gather nothing against the offering of y^e daily Sacrifice without companie receiving y^e Communion with y^e priest, which thei call private Masse. And because y^e Scripture hath no commandment binding y^e laie folke to receive the blessed Sacrament oftentimes, therefore S. Chrysostom blith not wordes of commandment vnto them, but only of exhortation, which he would haue uttered otherwise, if it had been expressly commanded by Scripture.

And againe in the same Homilie he saith, The Deacon standing on high, calleth some to the Communion, and putteth of some: thrusteth out some, and bringeth in some. Chrysostome saith, some are called, and some are brought in * to receive which the Priest. Where then is now M. Hardinges Nemo? *Harding.*

You make your selfe merry like a pleasant Wine with the terme Nemo, and cal it M. Hardinges Nemo: wherein you do S. Chrysostome wrong, for the worde wherupon y^e grownd is his, it is not mine. This y^e you allege here, was not done at al times, when so euer any priest offered the daily Sacrifice, nor in every Church: but at certaine solempne feastes specially at Easter, and in Cathedral churches, & where els a number of priests & Deacons were alwaies remaining. S. Chrysostom in y^e place out of which you preed this allegation, declareth the maner that the Deacon's used at Easter chiefly, and at other high feastes, when the people generally, or for a great parte, received the Communion. That this custome was ordinarie at every celebration of the Sacrifice, of his wordes it can not necessarily be gathered.

ag. y^e w.
patcheth
pieces of
S. Chry-
sostomes
sentences
together,
& thereby
corrupteth
and falsifi-
eth his
meaning.
The 195.
entrust.
S. Chry-
sostome
saith not
so.

And whereas you make S. Chrysostome to say, that some are
 hath little cause here
 so to tri-
 umph.
 He mang-
 leth & cut-
 teth his
 Authors
 sentences.
 (by the Deacon) called, and some are brought in, and thereupon tri-
 umph as though you had waime the feeling. Where then is he that
 Harding saith? Must I tell you, & small occasion of such a vaine
 bragge had ben geuen you, if you had not so wily mangled the
 sentence, and cut away certaine wordes, that disclose the whole
 meaning of S. Chrysostome. A man that readeth but your
 hatt wordes, would thinke the Deacon brought in some by the
 hande of the wise, to receive with the delect; for so you frame
 your tale. But S. Chrysostome reporteth more thus. The
 Deacon standing vpright in the sight of all the people, and crying
 out alowde, in that dreadful silence, some he calleth, and some he
 putteth off, some he setteth forth, some he bringeth in with his hand,
 But with his tongue more effectually, then with his hand. For
 that worde (he meaneth this worde Sancti, holy) falling into their
 eares, is euen as a hand driueth out some and bringeth in others.
 And to signifie what manners a driving out and bringing in this
 was, he saith afterward more plainly. Stat apud nos & nunc
 Proco, no capite queneque regens & producens, sed omnes pariter
 interiori deuens capite. Among vs also now (at the great as-
 semblies) standeth the Cryer, not holding enery one & bringing
 him forth by the head, but staying altogether by the inward head.
 Dear (ye our Reader) no more so. Heuyl, with betwixt
 away of that which declareth the truth in any doubt. The crye
 of the Deacon sounding in their eares, Sancta sanctis, holy things
 for the holy, gaue warning that they came not unworthily to
 that holy table, as it required them to be holy that came, which
 was a bringing in, so it fraid away and excluded them, who found
 them selues in conscience unholy and unworthy. So that this
 bringing in, and thrusting out, was altogether spiritual. Of all
 which S. Chrysostome made mention, ouly to set before the
 peoples

Chryst.

ad popu.

putteth

Memor

queneque

interiori

deuens

capite

Stat apud

nos & nunc

Proco,

no capite

queneque

regens &

producens,

sed omnes

pariter

interiori

deuens

capite.

Among

vs also

now

(at the

great

as-

semblies)

standeth

the

Cryer,

not

holding

enery

one &

bringing

him

forth

by the

head,

but

staying

altogether

by the

inward

head.

Dear

(ye our

Reader)

no

more

so.

Heuyl,

with

betwixt

away

of that

which

declareth

the

truth

in any

doubt.

The

crye

of the

Deacon

sounding

in their

eaues,

Sancta

sanctis,

holy

things

for the

holy,

gaue

warning

that

they

came

not

unworthily

to

that

holy

table,

as

it

required

them

to be

holy

that

came,

which

was

a

bringing

in,

so

it

fraid

away

and

excluded

them,

who

found

them

selues

in

conscience

unholy

and

unworthy.

So

that

this

bringing

in,

and

thrusting

out,

was

altogether

spiritual.

Of

all

which

S. Chrysostome

made

mention,

ouly

to

set

before

the

peoples

peoples eyes, how none but holy and worthy might be admitted to receiue those holy mysteries. He speaketh not in expresse wordes of the peoples communicating with him: but quite contrarywise he rebuketh their once coming in the yere, not so much for that they came but once, as for that they came euen then also unworthily, or els soone after Easter fel vnto their olde disorder of life againe.

Ieruel.

Chrysostome saith, Some are called, and some are brought in to receiue with the priest. Where then is now M. Hardinges Nemo?

Harding.

S. Chrysostom saith not, some are brought in to receiue with the priest. To receiue with the priest, is your owne addition. And although the Deacon made his solemn proclamation, by which he called the people to come forth and receiue, vpon high and solemn feastes, as at Easter, witsonneday, Christmasse, Epiphanie. &c: yet at sundry other times might the priestes stand at the altare, and offer the Daily Sacrifice, when none came to receiue, as here he maketh complaint. And so now S. Chrysostomes Nemo, wherewith after your scoffing manner you least, calling it M. Hardinges Nemo, hath his place.

Ieruel.

Verily if there were some people with the priest, then was there no place for no body: If no body receiued, then is it not true that Chrysostome saith, that some receiued.

Harding.

Though there were some people present with the priest when he celebrated, yet might it be, that none receiued the Sacrament with him, as S. Chrysostome by his complaint signifieth. And so was there place for no body. And though no body

¶ Ieruel.
saith not
S. Chrysostome by
wordes of
his owne
addition.

¶ S. Chrysostomes
Nemo
hath his
place.

¶ The 19.
Intrach.
S. Chrysostome
saith not
there that
some receiued.

¶ CC. 1.

¶ recei-

A Reioindre to

received, yet S. Chrysostome said truth, for he said not, that some received, as you report him buttuly. It were better you were no body, then thus to teach false Doctrine, helpling euery body.

Level.

Here of a false principle, M. Harding, as his vvont is, gheasseth out the like conclusion: If there vvere so fewve Communicantes in that populous Citie of Antioche, vvhere the scriptures vvere daily expounded: then it is likely in Countrie Churches there vvere none at al. This argument hangeth onely by likelyhoods, as do the reast of his making: and being set in order it standeth thus: There vvvas no Priuate Masse in the great Citie of Antioche: Ergo there vvvas priuate Masse in the Countrie. Surely (good reader) this is a very countrie argument, vvhat so euer it seme to M. Harding.

Harding.

If the principle be false, why haue you not by good reason dispposed it? That you replic out of S. Chrysostome in Acta Apost. Hom. 45. concerning them of Constantinople, is beside the purpose, for I speake of Antioche. If my woult be to gheasse out Conclusions, how is it, that you haue filled your boke with so litle certainty and assured mater, but altogether with light and vnlanery pelfe? My Countrie argument shal seme probable to the wiser sorte of y Citie, I doubt not, if it be thoroughly weigh- ed and considered. Because you haue weighed it with false balance, and taken away parte of the weight, who like to weigh it better, thus in my booke it is reported. See reader, and iudge.

Egl. 30. b

Now if Chrysostome had cause to complaine of the peoples slacknesse in coming to the Communion, in that great and populous Citie of Antioche, vvhere the scriptures vvere daily expounded and preached, vvhere Discipline and good order was more straightly exacted, vvhere in so great number some of likelyhood were of more Denotion then others: vvhat is to be thought of many other litle townes and villages throngh the world, vvhere
little

little preaching was heard, where discipline flaked, where the number of the faithful being small, and they occupied altogether in worldly affairs, few gave good example of Devotion to others: Doubtlesse in such places was much lesse recourse of the people at the Masse time, to receive the Sacrament with theyr Priestes. Thus there.

Now unless you wil say, there were more wel disposed and devout people in every village & small parrish, then in the great Citie of Antioche, of reason you must graunt, that if there wanted number of Communicantes at Antioche, much more it wanted in some parrish churches. If it were so, then it followeth, that either they had the Sacrifice without a companie receiving with the priest, which you make to be private Masse, or that commonly they had no Sacrifice at al, which is not to be graunted. For a broode out of the great Citie Chriſten people had then their ordinarie Synaxes, that is, meetings and assemblies, holydaies & Seruice, whereof the Masse was the chiefe, as it may wel be proved by sundry ancient Councils. And thus is the weight of my Countreie argument, (as M. Jewell teacheth) heavier, then that is may so easily be lifted away by his light scosse.

Jewel.

And further whereas to advance the Citie, and to abase the Countreie he saith, the people in Cities were Daily taught by open sermons, here in he must needs be content, that his ghaſse gave place unto the truth. For Chrysostom him selfe saith farre otherwise. Thus he speaketh unto the people of the Citie. Dum per hebdomadem semel vocamus vos. &c. (see the place Reader.) I note not this for that I mislike with daily preaching, but for that vnto truth so boldly presumed should not passe vntouched.

Harding.

Say here rather must M. Jewell be content to hear, that his dealing is first very false. For St. Chrysostom hath no such saying at al

&c. y.

neither

The. 197.
Truth.
I say not
so, let my
booke be
line. 197.
Pag. 91.
The. 198.
Truth.
It is no
truth,
I speake
it only of
Antioch.

A Reioindre to

Ms. 199.
bfech false
allegatio.

neither in Acta. hom. 45. neither in Match. hom. 5. as he hath can-
sed his booke to be quoted : next, very vnjust, and vntoucheous,
so bitterly to charge me with vnt ruth, where none is. For if
S. Chrysostome haue any such place, very like it is, that it ma-
kerh more against him then with him, els by his false quotation
he would not haue lead the reader from it. And yet for the vn-
truth as he calleth it, to be tryed out, reade my boke ouer againe
and againe gentle Reader, and (trust me) thou shalt no where
finde the wordes, with which M. Jewel burtheneth me. If he
make me to say what pleaseth him, what marvel is it, if he blama
me, where no fault is? If this then be an vnt ruth, it is M. Je-
wels vnt ruth, verely myne it is not.

Iewel.

The 199.
vnt ruth.
I say not
so. This
is altoge-
ther falsi-
ty.

Yet *saith M. Harding, in smal countrie Churches either the priest
let cease the Daily Sacrifice, or els be receiued alone. But the Daily Sacri-
fice ceased not: for then that had ben left yndone, that Christe commaun-
ded to be donne: Ergo, there vvas Priuate Masse. O M. Harding, is it
not possible, your doctrine may stande without lies? So many vnt ruthes,
in so litle roome, without shame of the worlde, without feare of God?
VWhere did Christe euer commaunde you to make your Sacrifice? By vwhat
comission? By vwhat v wordes? VWhere did Christe vvil you to doo it
euery day? VWhere did Christe euer cal it the Daily Sacrifice? Or vwhere
euer learned you that the remembrance perteineth more to the priest, then
to the people? &c.

Harding.

The 200.
vnt ruth.
I say it
not, it is
falsly im-
puted vn-
to me.
M. Jew.
corrupteth
and falsifi-
eth my
wordes &
my reason.

You falsifie my wordes, and set forth my reasons to disad-
uantage, and then you make yout ouertie, and say, O M. Har-
ding. &c. But if the Reader wil be indifferent, and peruse what
I say in dede, and not what you report of me, he shal fynde you a
false Merchant & double dealer, and so be moued on the other syde
to crye out, O M. Jewel, what false partes be these? Both yout
aduersarie the truth so farre on his syde, that you can not replie,
but

but with falsifying his wordes, and misreporting his reasons? Neither is this spoken of this place onely, but in general of his whole booke.

And *Spz* demaunde you, where Christ euer commanded vs to doo this Sacrifice? If you were a member of Christs Church, I would say vnto you as Christe said to Nicodemus: Are you a Doctour in Israel, and knowe not this? If telling it Iohn. 3. would euer haue donne you good, you would not now so blasphemously haue asked it by way of contempt. For the auncient and holy Fathers, Martyrs, and Confessours, that from the Apostles time to our daies haue writte, haue euery one most plainly tolde it you. And yet you beleue it not: at least whereas once you beleued it, now you are departed from it. whereas once you confessed it, and witnessed it with your handwritting, before a multitude of learned men in the Vniuersitie of Oxford, now with hand and tongue you impugn it. So of a Jewell, you are become a Iulian.

For the Christian Readers sake, I make this brief answer to your demaunde. Christe at his last supper commanded his Apostles, and their successors to offer this Sacrifice of the Altare (for so *S. Augustine* calleth it) saying, Doo ye, or make ye this in my remembrance. So hath the holy ghost euer taught the Church by the mouthes and penne of the Fathers: of whom many haue confirmed the same Doctrine with their bloude. Because I haue spoken heretofore, and more is hereafter to be spoken in confutation of the Replie vpon the. 17. Article, where it is specially treated: few testimonies may suffice in this place.

S. Dionysius that blessed bishop and Martyr, who learned the truth of *S. Paule* him selfe, wyrteth thus. Wherefore the Bishop both reuerently and according vnto his bishoply office, after the holy praises of Gods workes, excuseth him selfe, for that he

The making of the Sacrifice was instituted and commanded at Christs last Supper. Mat. 26.

Testimonies for the Sacrifice. Dionys. eccl. hier. part.

A Reioindre to

Christ
saith. Doe
this. &c.

offereth vp the healthful Sacrifice which is aboue his degree, first crying out vnto him in seemely wise, Tu dixisti, hoc facite in meam commemorationem. Thou hast said the worde, Doe ye this in my remembrance. The sense whereof is this, as though the Bishop should say vnto god. Verely I should not be so hardy as to offer the Sacrifice vnto thee my Lord God, except that I should do it, with these wordes thou hadst commaunded me.

Iren contra
hereses.

lib. 4. ca. 32

Christe
taught the
Sacrifice.

The holy Martyr and Bishop S. Irenus, who was nigh the Apostles time, saith likewise speaking of this vnbloody Sacrifice: Christe tooke that which is by creation bread, and gaue thanks, saying, this is my body. And the cuppe likewise which is of a creature that is with vs, and confessed it to be his blood, and taught vs the newe Oblation of the newe Testament, which the Church receiuing it of the Apostles, offereth vp vnto God ouer the whole worlde.

Cyprian.

lib. 2. epi. 3.

Christe
hath commaunded
the Sacrifice to be
done.

If in the Sacrifice, which is Christe, (saith S. Cyprian) none but Christ be to be folowed, Verely it behoueth vs so to obey and doo that which Christ hath done, and which he hath comaunded to be done. For if Iesus Christ our Lord and God be the highest priest of God the Father, and if he first haue offred Sacrifice vnto God the Father, and commaunded this to be made in remembrance of him: then that priest doeth the stede of Christ truly, which foloweth that as Christe did, and then he offereth a true and ful Sacrifice vnto God the Father in the Church, if he begyn so to offer, as he seeth Christe him selfe to haue offred.

A true
and ful
Sacrifice.

Here haue we, that Christ is the Sacrifice, & he Sacrificed himself, that he is to be folowed of priestes, in that which he did, & comaunded to be done, that this is a true & ful Sacrifice offred vnto God in the Church. what can be said more plainly?

To these thre blessed and learned Martyrs, let vs ioyne S. Chrysostome a blessed Confessor, who wrote the whole order & service

service of the Masse in which this Sacrifice is offered. Thou O Lord (saith he) hast ordeined the rite of Sacrifices, and hast delivered vnto vs the celebration of this solemne and vnspotted Sacrifice, as being the Lorde of al. &c. I beseech thee therefore looke vnto me a synner, and thy vnprofitable seruauant, purge my soule and hart of euil conscience, and make me meete with the vertue of thy spirite, and grace of thy priesthod, that I may stande at this thy holy table, and consecrate thy holy and immaculate body, and precious blood. For to thee I come. &c. And suffer, that these giftes may be offered vnto thee of me a synner, and thy vnworthy seruauant. For thou arte he that offerest, and arte offered, both that takest and gennest; Christ our God. Lo Christ is the Sacrifice that we offer as S. Cyprian said, he is the offerer, and the thing offered, he both taketh the Sacrifice of vs, and genneth the Sacrifice to vs. He hath instituted the rite and manner, and hath deliuered vnto vs the celebration of this Sacrifice. And this hath he done, as the Lord of al. For els no man could of his owne power and auctoritie haue ordeined this so high and so diuine a thing.

After this he acknowlegeth the making of this Sacrifice to be Christs commaundement, for immediately after consecration he saith thus: Memoriam igitur agentis salutaris huius mandati. &c. therefore we calling to remembrance, or performing the memorie of this healthful commaundement, of al thinges doone for vs, of thy Crosse, sepulchre, resurrection, &c. At length also he cometh to make his prayer for the dead, and for the quicke, and saith: Remember (O Lorde) al them that be a sleape in the hope of resurrection and life euerslasting, and make them to be at rest, where the light of thy countenance is scene. Now cal no more vpon vs O Jewel so malapertly to shew you, where and by what words Christ commaunded vs to celebrate this Sacrifice.

&c. lxx

You.

Christ hath ordeined the sacrifice. Chrysostom in Liturgia.

Christ offereth, and is offered.

S. Chrysostom expositively calleth this sacrifice a Commemorative.

S. Chrysostome prayeth for the dead at his Masse.

A Reioindre to

You see what worthy Fathers they be, that haue auouched it, and vpon what grounde they haue donne it.

Q. Jew.
demands
beth mala-
pert and
needlesse
questions.

To your other captious questions, I answer negatively. what so euer Christe would vs to do touching the diuine Oblation, that it be made by each particular priest every day: it is not so expessed in Scripture. Neither that euer he called it the Daily Sacrifice. what neede had you, or what moued you to aske these questions? And who euer said, the remembrance of Christes death pertaineth more to the Priest, then to the people? If no man euer said these thinges, what spite is there in you, so adously to demaunde of vs these questions, as though they appertained to our Doctrine? Touching this last, the people is bound to remember Christes death, as wel as the priestes: but to do this holy Ministerie, and to celebrate this high Sacrifice, to consecrate the body and bloud of Christe, and to offer the same in commemoration or remembrance of Christes death, it belongeth specially to priestes, and though with the bowe also of the faithfull people, yet by the Ministerie of the priestes. onely is this donne,

The people is bound to remember Christes death, & priestes are bound by celebration of the Sacrifice to bring the same to remembrance

to whom it is said, Doo ye this in my remembrance.

A new band of vaine questions,

After this, as though your Conscience gaue you, that you should be ouerthrowen in the other questions, you renew the feeld as it were, & come in with a new band of vaine questions concerning Daily Masse, as though if we could sufficiently proue the Masse, yet we should sticke at the daily Masse. Therefore you say,

Ieruel.

Who euer commanded your priest to say, your daily Masse? What lawe, what Decree, what Decretal, what Legantine, what prouincial? Or what priest euer was there, that said it Daily?

Harding.

Here is much a doo, but answer is sone made. Though no one Priest euer said it Daily, yet is it, and long hath it ben every day said by sundry priestes, verely within the first

lit

fix. C. yeres, was very often said and celebrated, and thereof it is called, not the daily Masse, but the daily Sacrifice in manner euerypwhere in the Fathers, as they knowe, who be conuersant in their writings.

Daily
Sacrifice.

And that the Masse be celebrated, we haue lawes, Decrees, and auncient Councils, moe then I thinke it necessary to recite here. When any man professing defence of the Catholike religion, wil be so far ouerseen as to mainteine opinion, that eche Priest ought of bounden dutie to say Masse euery day, then against such a one wil al that serue you which you haue raked here together, out of Beccam, Linwode, Innocentius the third, Thomas of Aquine, and out of Vitas Patrum, for stuffing of your booke. But when noman affirmeth any such absurditie, you may vnlode such needlesse wares in some other voyde roome. With this and such other trash you haue raised the price of your booke, and haue dammaged the common welch, causing so bad stuffe to be so derely solde.

Inneces-
ry stuffing
of M. Ie-
wels boke

As for Cusanus the Cardinal whom here you repeate againe, it is a token you are neare dyuen, that you are faine to runne to him for helpe, specially out of that treatise, which he maketh purposely against the heretikes of Bohemia your predecessioners. So souldiers in the chase to escape the hādes of their enemies, oftentimes leap into the Sea, and the poore birde to escape the hawke sometime taketh succour of a house, whereof otherwise he would be afraid. What corners haue not you searched, what booke is there so litle worth, what rotten ragges be so vile, which you and your felowes for you haue not turned and tossed, to finde out somewhat (not so much for the defence of your Gospel, for litle can you defende, your profession is rather to impugne) that may haue some colour contrary to that the Church now (I wil not say beleueth, but) obserueth:

Cusanus
is drawe
into helpe,
where of
purpose he
impug-
neth this
new Gos-
pel.

DD I The

A Reioindre to

The mater is answered befoze. Though it witnesse that the
One kinde receiued. deacon receined the Sacrament vnder the forme of breade onely at the Priestes hande, whereby receiuing vnder one kinde is anouched, which maketh against you: yet your continuation, wherto a companie of thye at the least is requisite to receiue which the priest, is not thereof inferred. So at Cardinal Cusanus handes, your cause synderth no succour at al, but contrarywise hinderance and controul. And though a deacon receined at euery Solemne Masse the one kinde of the priest, yet that forbiddeth not, but that it was laful for a Priest to say Masse, without a deacon in time and place, where a deacon was not alwaies ready and disposed. Cusanus therre telleth what was of custome donne, and that in cathedral Churches, and at solempne feastes: he sheweth not what was euery where, and alwaies of necessitie to be donne.

Now this was your parte and promise, to proue, that S. Chrysostome, or any other Priest could not possibly say Masse, onlesse
Mr. Jew choosing & baser part impugneth the doctrine of the Church & proueth not his owne. there were a companie to receiue with him. But when you come to shew the proues of your doctrine, thanked be God, they be as weak as y aduersarie would wish. And therfore you haue done foolishly in taking vpon you to disproue the Catholike doctrine, & not to proue your owne. For who knoweth not how much easier it is, rashly to deny, then with reason to affirme, to disproue, then to proue, as easier it is to throwe downe, then to set vp, to destroy, then to buylde: As it is said in the gospel of that blessed womā Marie, S. Marthas sister, that she had chosen the best parte, whereby to serue God: so it may be said of you M. Jewel and of your felowes, you haue chosen the easiest parte, whereby to serue Antichriste.

Jewel.

But what a vponderful case is this? the Masse, that we most neede, belene

beleue is so auncient, so vniuersal, so Catholique, so holy, so glorious, * cannot be founde neither in Churches, nor in Chapels, nor in Secrete Oratories, nor in priuate houses in Towne or Citie, but must be sought out in some petite parish in the Countrey, and that by coniecture onely, and by gheasse, and by such recordes, as directly condemne the whole order of the Masse, and will suffer no man to be present there at, but onely such as will receive.

Harding.

Al this wynde shaketh no corne. This tale sheweth more spite, than maketh prouise. And as it proueth nothing, so it dispro- ueth nothing. As you take vpon you to denye the Masse impu- dently, so on the contrary side, I will be holde to affirme it truly. And to adde authoritie vnto holdenesse, soasmuch as here I meane by the name of Masse, specially the vmbloody Oblation of Christe in the Daily Sacrifice of the Church, which Cōsecra- tion presupposed, is done in the holy seruice of the Masse: I haue proued it in the beginning of this treatise by witness of sun- dry fathers, and euen here in this very Division, by the witness of S. Dionysius, S. Irenæus, S. Cyprian, and S. Chrysostom. Neither were it hard, if I would in this place tarrye vpon it, and enlarge my booke, to proue it by a farre greater number of testimonies.

And because we are now in hande with a place of S. Chry- sostome, it shal not be beside the purpose out of the same place to allege you his testimonie for the Masse. As when a lorde (saith he) cometh vnto the table, the seruantes that haue offended him, must not be present, but be put out of his sight: so euen here also whiles the Sacrifice is brought forth, and Christe is Sacrificed, and the sheepe of our lorde, &ceter. the like he saith an other where τὸν Χριστὸν τιθύναι θύον, that is to say, when Christe is Sacrificed. So then you haue tes- timonies for the Masse celebrated not only in some petite parish

The. 101.
vnto truth.
The Sac-
crifice of
Masse is
proued to
haue ben
made in
Chur-
ches, & ora-
tories, &
that in
Townes
& Citie,
as here it
is proued.

Chrysost.
hom. 61. ad
popul. An-
tiochen.
Et Chri-
stus im-
molatur.
Ad Ephes.
ca. hom. 3.

DDd ij as

A Reioindre to

Ad popul. Antioche. hom. 61. & ad Ephes. hom. 3.
as you terme it, but also in two of the greatest Cities of the worlde, Constantinople, and Antioche, for of them speaketh S. Chrysostome, in those two homilies: As S. Cyprian is to be vnderstanded to meane of the Sacrifice celebrated in the Citie of Carthage, S. Irenaeus of Libs, S. Dionysius of Athens. which famous Cities I trowe, you will not accompt for petty Parishes in the Countrie.

The vertue of a private Masse is molesse the of a publicke Masse.

If S. Chrysostome would suffer no man to be present at Masse, but onely such as would receiue, for so you say, although vnruly, (for he was faine to suffer them though to some grief of his mynde, as it appeareth by the two forementioned homilies): yet, were it true, the Masse of it selfe for al that is neerer the more vnlawful, or a thing the more vngodly. For whether many receiue with the priest, or the priest receiue al one, if the one Masse, where many receiue be good, the other can not be evil: because the vertue of the Sacrifice consisteth not in the receiuers, or communicantes, but in the Institution of Christe, and in the thing offered. The vertue of that which we call the Masse, standeth in the Consecration, which Consecration is as good in a private Masse, that is, when a Priest receiveth alone, as in the publike, or whē he hath a multitude to receiue with him. For such multitude of receiuers geneth no vertue to the wordes, by power of which the body and bloud of Christe are consecrated.

Thus then is the Masse in it selfe of one substance, vertue, and force, whether many receiue the Sacrament with the Priest, or he receiue alone, and so farre is private Masse touched. If people be so vnderuente, as they can not be brought to receiue, that is their default, against whō you may speake your pleasure an other while, it is not the Priestes default, nor any diminishing of the vertue of the Sacrifice. That great benefite is

enio

enjoyed of the fewer, the benefite it selfe by their vnderstanding is not diminished. As the benefite of Christes passion is neuer the lesse, though many men through infidelitie, heresie, and wicked life departe from Christe, and toyne them selues vnto Antichriste.

Iewel.

For thus saith Chrysostome * If thou stand by, and do not communicate, thou arte malaprete, thou arte shamelesse, thou arte impudent - 2. Thine eies be vnrworthy the sight hereof, vnrworthy be thine eares. 3. O thou wilt say: I am vnrworthy to be partaker of the holy Mysteries, then arte thou vnrworthy to be partaker of the prayers: 4. Thou maist no more stande here, then a * Heathen; that neuer was Christened.

Harding.

Good Reader this saying is altogether falsified. Though S. Chrysostom haue the like wordes in sundry places, yet speake he not in this sort and order, as M. Jewel, would thee to beleue. Much lesse meaneth he, as this falsifier repositeth his sense, with wordes of his owne forging. This whole allegation is patched together out of foure diuerse places of his thirde Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Ephesians, betweene each parte sundry sentences intermedled.

The first parte containeth not S. Chrysostomes wordes. That which he saith, is thus. Πᾶς ὁ μὴ τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ κυρίου, ἀναίχωντος, ἡ ἱερατικῆς ἐκκλησίας. that is to say: Every one that receiveth not the Mysteries, is impudent, and hath staid here rashly. For thou must vnderstand Reader these wordes, as spoken by S. Chrysostome, after that Masse is done, and after that the Priest hath received. For after al this, did the people Communicate, when so euer they Communicated. And thus he spake to the intent he might moue them to receiue oftener, specially at every such solemne Masse. M. Jewel hath added

Chrysost.
ad Ephes.
hom. 3.

The. 102.
vnto truth.

These be
M. Jewels

for:
ged wordes

they denot
S. Chrysostomes

owne
wordes.

The. 103.
vnto truth.

S. Chrysostome

saith not
thus.

M. Jewel
corrupteth

& falsifieth
S. Chrysostome,

& patcheth
together

diuerse sentences,

which in
him be

laid forth
in sundry

places.

DDO ij vnto

A Reuindre to

unto the sentence by his rhetorical exaggeration, more then the Doctor meant.

If such heate and vehemencie of speech would stirre the people at this day vnto worthy receiuing of the Communion with the Priest every day, or at least every Sunday: would God the like tale were now also tolde them. Every good Catholique man doubtlesse would be glad of it, and praise God for it. But if they vpon reuerence, and of a deuout feare, restraîne to receive: I thinke it not good now to dīne them out of the church at Masse time. For neither S. Chrysostom commanded that to be done: Neither doth he order his talke otherwise, then as one that maketh an exhortation. You heare him allege no scripture that commaundeth the people at every time to receive with the priest when he sacrificeth: he complaineth nowhere of breach of any precept.

The second parte of this saying is in an other place spoken of them, who not being cleane in conscience, but hauing the spot and winckle of deadly sinne in their soule, be vnworthy not onely to receive, but also to beholde and heare these mysteries. Of such he saith, vnworthy be their eies, vnworthy be their eares. And to put the more terrour in their heartes, comparing them to beastes in consideration of their filthy sinnes, he allegeth the Exod. 19 Scripture saying, Si bestia tetigerit montem, lapidibus obruetur. If a beast touch the hill, it shalbe stoned to death. Now St. Ieswel being loth the people should be present at Masse, referreth this indifferently to al them that stand by, and do not Communicate, of what merite so euer they be. And what in him lyeth, dīneth them from the Church.

The third parte is found a sundre from the reste of this saying in an other place. And it is vnderstanded to be spoken of one putteth a barre against the grace of the holy Ghost, so as it can
na

not enter: As if a man beare malice to an other, wil not forgive, or otherwise have a minde and wil to sinne. To such a one saith S. Chrysostome: How tarriedst thou, and didst not participate of the holy table? I am vnworthy, thou saist. Then arte thou vnworthy to communicate in prayers. And he meaneth it of the prayers that be made at Masse, after the Penitentes and Catechumens were commanded out of the Church.

The fourth parte of this allegation is placed an otherwhere, and is by M. Jewel falsified worst of al. Chrysostomes words be these. If a beast saith the Scripture, touch the hil, it shal be oppressed with stones. So the Iewes were not worthy so much as to go vp: albeit afterwarde they went, and saw where God had stand. Then followeth that which he speaketh unto the vnworthy looker on. *ἔστι μὴ αὐτὰ προσελθεῖν, καὶ ἰδεῖν, ὅταν μὲν ἴσται παρῇ, ἀπιδί. οὐκ ἔστι σοι μάλλον, ἢ τῷ καθ' ἑμὲν.* As much to say, It is laful for thee anon to come and see. But when he is present, go thy way. It is no more laful for thee, then for a Catechumen, as much to say, a learner of the faith, not yet baptized.

Here is to be noted by the way, that S. Chrysostome in this place acknowledgeth a special presence of Christ in the blessed Sacrament. For if Christ were not present in the Mysteries otherwise then he is by his divine Maistie everwhere: he would not have said, anon to come (when the Communion is al received) thou maist come (to the altar) and see, but when he is present, gete thee hence. So by S. Chrysostome Christ is presente in the Mysteries: when they are ended, he is not so present, and therefore a sinner may come to the place where he was, and see.

But that any person which receiveth not, may stand at the

DDd iij Masse

A special presence of Christ acknowledged by S. Chrysostom to be in the Sacrament.

A Requindre to

I Cate-
chumen is
in better
statethen a
heathen as
we meane
speaking
of an hea-
then.

Masse and be presente, no more then a heathen that neuer was
Chrystened, so much S. Chrysostome saith not. Although a
Catechumen be not yet Chrystened, yet he is in farre better state
then a heathen, by whom we vnderstand an Infidel. For the
Catechumens many of them were perfite beleuers, though they
differred to be baptized for a time. Thus hast thou good Reader
the wordes of this holy Doctour truly laid before thee. which as
they containe an earnest and vehement exhortation to the people
to receiue the Sacrament, & to roote out al such vices that made
them unworthy of it: so they be not spoken against the blessed
Sacrifice of the Masse, to which purpose they are by M. Jewel
vntreuely applyed.

Jewel.

The. 104.
vntreue.
This is a
falle re-
porte both
of S. Chri-
stomes
wordes &
of his mea-
ning.

And touching him selfe he saith, In vaine we come to offer the daily
Sacrifice: In vaine we stande at the Altar. Meaning thereby, as may
appeare, that if he said priuate Masse, for lacke of companie, it was in
vaine.

Harding.

This man almost neuer allegeth his Doctour truly. He
saith not, In vaine we come to offer the daily Sacrifice. Neither that
he saith there, toucheth him selfe, as M. Jewel would the Rea-
der to vnderstand, but rather the people, who were present at the
Sacrifice, and receiued not. But he would haue this
pointe beleued, that the priest in saying Masse, doth al in
vaine, if the people receiue not. And therefore he forgeth a false
sense, saying. And touching him selfe, he saith, &c. And yet if the
people receiued neuer so much (as in these Countreies and in o-
ther places out of England they receiue very often) would not
he so be content, and allowe the Masse: so great hatred by the
inspiration of Satan hath he conceived against the external Sa-
crifice of the Church.

But

But if the people forslow to do their dutie, and dispose not them selfe to come and receiue, yet doth not the Priest in vaine touching him selfe (as this great ennemie of this Sacrifice saith) come to offer the daily Sacrifice. For touching him selfe, he doth that which Christ commanded his Disciples, and their successors to do. He consecrateth the body and blond of Christe, he offereth and presenteth him vnto God, he prayeth for the people, and for him selfe, in presence of which Sacrifice teares craue not forgeuenesse in vaine, saith S. Cyprian: he celebrateth the memorie of Christes death, he geueth thanks to God for Christes sake. This and much moze he doth, to the inestimable benefite of him selfe, and of the people, specially of such as be in state to receiue grace, whose publike Minister he is. Therefore false it is that M. Jewel saith vpon S. Chrysostom, that he should say touching him selfe, as in the behalfe of euery Priest, when the people receiued not, he came in vaine to offer the Daily Sacrifice.

The worde of S. Chrysostome is this: The daily Sacrifice is in vaine. He saith not, we come in vaine to offer the daily Sacrifice. Our coming to the Altar, and our offering is not in vaine. But the Sacrifice *Iuris*, (for that is the worde) the consecrated hoste, is in vaine, not touching him selfe, that is to say the priest, as M. Jew. would haue it vnderstanded, nor touching hoste it selfe, but touching people, and how, I shal here declare anon. Againe he saith, *παραστηναι* we haue stand at Altar in vaine: whereby he meaneth a long standing & waiting of priestes (after hoste was done) to see who would come & receiue. But none came, and in that respect their standing was in vaine. So that al is to be referred to them that refused to receiue, not to the Priestes office, that said Masse, nor to the Sacrifice it selfe: which Masse M. Jewel ghesaith to be in vaine, because it is said

The priest offereth not in vaine touching him selfe, though people do not receiue with him. Mat. 26. Luc. 22. 1. Cor. 11 Cyprian. de cana Domini.

Frustra quotidia- num Sa- crificium. The masse is not in vaine in it selfe, but priestes standing & waiting for the people is in vaine whē they refuse to receiue the Communion.

¶ ¶ ¶ without

A Reioindre to

**Sacrifice
& Eulster.**

without companie of receiuers. Among other thinges, this much is not to be dissembled. How so euer M. Jewel handle this place of S. Chrysostome, he can not with al his Rhetorike, nor with any other wile auoide, but he must needs graunt the Sacrifice, and that daily, and an Eulster, which he, as also the rest of those Gospellers deny utterly.

**The. 105.
Intruch.**

This
much I
see not
here, nei-
ther is
there any
cause why
I should
see it.

**The. 106.
Intruch.**

I say not
so. In this
paragraph
is a conti-
nual falsi-
fying of my
wordes &
sense, as
here I de-
clare, and
my booke
witnesseth
Dut. 10. 9

Fol. 13. b.

Chrysost.

in Demon-

strations

aduersus

Gentiles,

quod Chri-

stus sit

Deus.

Iewel.

Here M. Harding *seeing that his Masse, euen by his owne au-
thoritie is shrewdly crackte, and least for vaine, assayeth to salue it, as
vvel as he may. *The Masse (saith he) is not in vaine in it selfe, but
vnto the people that wil not come. This is a glose beside the text: yet let
vs take it as it vvore true. But if hearing of the Masse he a thing plea-
sant vnto God, and meritorious vnto the people: if Christ be there offered in
dede for the sinnes of the vvorlds, if the Priest alone may receiue for al the
rest, if it be sufficient for the people to communicate spiritually, as M. Harding
hath auouched; then is not the saying of the Masse in vaine, no not vnto
the people, no although they neuer vvould communicate. Chrysostom saith, it
is in vaine, M. Harding saith, it is not in vaine. And yet to see a grea-
ter contradiction, M. Harding him selfe in this place saith, it is in vaine
vnto the people: And yet the same M. Harding hath saide before, it is com-
mended by Councels, it is sufficient for the people to communicate in spi-
rit, it is not in vaine vnto the people.

Harding.

If eyes were good prouers, I were confuted. But the
Masse (say you) is shrewdly crackte. By towhome I pray you?
By you M. Jewel. Alas good Syr. though you be a greate
cracker, yet be you in these pointes but a weake cracker. So no
Syr, falshed can not cracke the truth. Had your mattoches
and pickaxes ben of no more strenght in hewing and tearing
downe the anlters of God, that S. Chrysostome so many hun-
dred yeares past, saide to haue ben set vp in our countreies of Bri-
taine, then your lying R. plic is of reach of learning in cracking
the

the Masse: the altars (whereof S. Chrysostome here speaketh) had still remained whole, as yet for al your Replie the Masse remaineth uncracked, and to the ende shal remaine in al places, but where Antichrist shal be folowed, and Christ forsaken. For consideration of al that you say here to proue me contrary to this holy Doctour, and contrary to my selfe, I require no more of the Reader, but to peruse my wordes, and consider, whether I say, as you reposite me to say, or whether the Repliemaker hath said buttrenely, and made his apparent gaine of lying, or no.

Forseeing this Replie would be made, in my booke I say thus. Fol. 30. b. whereas S. Chrysostome saith, the Daily Sacrifice was in vaine, and the Priestes stood at the Altar in vaine: it is not to be vnderstanded of the Sacrifice in it selfe (that is my terme there, the Masse I named not) as though it were in vaine and frustrate: but this is to be referred to the people, it was in vaine for their parte, that should haue receiued the Communion with the Priestes, who waited daily for them, and cryed out as the manner was, Sancta Sanctis, Holy thinges for the holy. And after that they had receiued the bread (that is, the Body of Christ vnder the forme of bread) therein selues, shewing the charite to the people, said, Come ye vp to receiue, with the feare of God, with faith and charitie. But al was in vaine. For none came, so colde was their deuotion in that behalfe. Thus there.

Now Iudge good Reader, how truly M. Jewell dealeth. He nameth the Masse, to make the matter more odious. I name not the Masse, but the Sacrifice, as S. Chrysostome doth. He maketh me to say, the Masse is not in vaine in it selfe, but vnto the people that wil not come. I say, whereas S. Chrysostom saith, the Daily Sacrifice was in vaine, it is not to be vnderstanded of the Sacrifice in it selfe, as though it were vaine and frustrate

A Reioindre to.

frustrate: but that this is to be referred to the people, it was in vaine for their part, that should haue receiued the Communion. I say not the Masse is in vaine vnto the people. That would you faine haue me say, I suppose. Forged dedes and counterfeite wrytes make no good prouise in Lawe, they be punished by Lawe.

Againe say you, Chrysostome saith, It is in vaine, M. Harding saith, it is not in vaine. which is *M. Jewel*: Nameth S. Chrysostome the Masse? Name I the Masse? he nameth the daily Sacrifice, and so do I, which is done and made in the Masse. And say I determinatly, it is not in vaine? Do I not qualifie my wordes, and say, It is not in vaine and frustrate in it selfe, but for the the peoples parte?

As you would make S. Chrysostome and me to seme to be at variance, so you go about to make your Reader beleue, I am at variance with my selfe. And yet say you, to see a greater

*M. Jewel
maketh a
false tale of
his owne,
and fathere-
th it vpon
me,*

contradiction (you might better haue said to see me make a greater lye) M. Harding him selfe in this place saith, It is in vaine vnto the people, and yet the same M. Harding hath said before, It is not in vaine vnto the people. To this what shal I say, but that al is a Lye? I say not in al my booke, the Masse is in vaine vnto the people, Neither say I, the Masse is not in vaine vnto the people. Onely I expounde S. Chrysostome, seeking how to iustifie his saying, and how to saue the truth from slanderous wjangles, of which sorte you shewe your selfe to be.

And whiles I do this, I confesse with S. Chrysostome the Sacrifice, whereby I meane as he doth, the hoste sacrificed, that is, the body of Christ, is in vaine, not in it selfe, not per se, as the Learned do speake, but on the peoples behalfe, for theyr parte that shoulde haue receiued it sacramentally.

*M. Jewel
againe saith*

S. Chry:

S. Chrysostome saith it is in vaine, because it hath not the full effect it should haue in the nature of a Sacrament receiued. This is no contradiction at al. Chyristes death is in vaine on their behalfe that beleue not, or diuide them selues from the Church his body mystical. Chyristes death is not in vaine for their parte that beleue, and perseuer in keping his preceptes vnto the ende. If I say thus, I say truly, who denieth? Yet shal a wrangler, as you are, replie and say: why then Chyristes death is in vaine, and it is not in vaine. It is no contradiction, nor inconuenience to say: a thing is in vaine, and not in vaine, in sundry respectes. Frustra percussisti filios vestros, I haue stricken your sonnes in vaine, saith God in p prophete Ieremie cap. 2. On Gods behalfe, they were not stricken in vaine, for God doth nothing in vaine. For their parte, it was in vaine. For they were not amended by it, as there it foloweth, disciplinam non receperunt: They receiued no correction thereby. Thus a thing may be donne in vaine, and not in vaine: and so to say, it is no absurde contradiction, as M. Iewel maketh of this.

Touthing this blessed Sacrifice, the body of Chyriste, it is consecrated specially and chiefly both for the representation of Chyristes death who is there present, & also that it be receiued sacramentally to our spiritual comfort. For those two endes is Consecration. Now if the Priest receiue it, and the people receiue it not: then for him it is not in vaine, and for their parte it is in vaine, quoad participationem sacramentalem, as concerning the sacramental participation and receiuing only. Yet is it not hereby denied, but that the Masse, in which the Sacrifice is consecrated, offered, and receiued of the Priest, may in other respectes be good and profitable to p people otherwise denouly disposed, for that they may communicate with the Priest spiritually in the lively remembrance of the passion of Chyriste with thanks giuing, be-
 cause

How the
Sacrifice
is in vain.

A Reioindre to

In vaine cause Christ who suffered passion and death, is there present.

And therefore whereas S. Chrysostome saith here in a vehemencie of speech, the daily Sacrifice is in vaine, yet is it not necessary to vnderstand him so precisely, as though he had meant, it were absolutely and simply in vaine. For his manner is to vse this worde *in vaine*, sometimes so, as it may beare a reasonable qualification. Complaining in an homilie of the peoples negligence, that regarded little the scriptures, the reader (saith he)

¶

Chrysost.

ad heb.

hom. 3. ex

cap. 5.

The 107

butruth.

S. Chrysostom

never spake

so. here is

a burthen

of sinnes and

blasphemies

laid together.

The 108.

butruth.

This is

not S.

Chrysostomes

sense, as

here I

proue. It

is the sēse

of Satan,

of Anti-

christ his

Captaine,

and of all

few. An-

richistes

forgetteth

goeth vp (twise oypthise euery weke) and telleth you first, whose booke it is, that he readeth out of, as for exaple, the booke of such or such a prophete. and then he vttereth what he saith. Therefore the thinges ought to be cleere vnto you, and ye should knowe not onely the texte it selfe, but also the very causes of the thinges that be written, and who spake them: sed omnia frustra, & sine fructu. But al is in vaine, and without fruite. He meant not in this place, that al was in vaine absolutely, both on the readers behalfe, and the peoples too. For euen there a litle before he excepteth a fewe, whom he thought not to be altogether ignorant of the thinges that were so commonly reherced by the reader. Yet because they profited lesse then his desire was they should, he saith, al is in vaine, and no good is donne at al.

¶ Seruel.

If M. Harding vvil stande vnto the authoritie of Chrysostome, let him not dissemble, but speake plainly vnto the people, * as Chrysostome spake. Let him say to them that come to heare his Masse, 1 If ye receiue not ye are shamelesse, ye are impudent: 2 Ye are not worthy to be partakers of the commū prayers: 3 Departe ye from the church: 4 ye haue no more place here, then Turkes and heathens: 5 your eyes be vnworthy to see these thinges, vnworthy be your eares: 6 Our Masses can not profite you: 7 they are not meritorious for you: 8 they please not God: 9 they prouoke his anger: 10 they are al in vaine. * This is Chrysostomes sense, and plaine meaning: and this is a fayre winding vp of M. Hardinges Cleuue.

Harding

Harding.

So for, not so, this is a fowle and a blasphemous winding
up of M. Jewels Clewe. Of any Clewe at al I made no men-
tion: it is but a cope of his head to spoyle withal. But beware he
(I earnestly advise him) least, if he recant not and repent by time,
being at length pulled into hel with the twined thread of such
blasphemous Cledes, he be bounde hande and foote with
cordes of the devils Clewe, and cast into the outward harte-
nelle, where shalbe weeping and grinding of teeth.

Beware good reader of this false and wicked doctrine, if
thou loue thy soule health. M. Jewel beareth thee in hande, that
S. Chrysostome hath spoken these wordes: and to cause thee
the rather so to beleue, he hath printed them in that distinct
letter, in which the Fathers sayings in his booke are printed.
Now I truely is, S. Chrysostome is here altogether falsified.
Touching the first and second sentence, he hath the like wor-
des, I graunt, and calleth him impudent and rash, that
standeth at the Mysteries, and receiveth not. Likewise he
that for his excuse saith, he is not worthy to participate, is
by him admonished, to be unworthy also of the Commu-
nion of prayers. That every such a one is unworthy to be
partaker of the Common prayers, it is false, and S. Chry-
sostome him self hath the contrary in his Liturgie, where he
maketh special mention of the Catechumens, and prayeth speci-
ally for them.

In this place he speaketh not of the Common prayers,
as M. Jewel reporteth, to exclude (as it seemeth) Gods peo-
ple from the hope of al benefite of prayers: but onely of the my-
stical prayers, or such as were said about the Consecration of the
Mysteries.

M. Jewe
slowly cor-
rupteth
and falsi-
fieth S.
Chrysost.

Common
prayers.

A Reioindre to

For this it is to be considered, that S. Chrysostome spake these wordes in respect of the custome and condition of that time. The Chyisten people and Infidels dwelled together. At the former parte of the Masse came the Catechumens, the possessed of spites, the Penitents, and at the Sermons the Infidels were permitted to be present. After Sermon, when Mysteries were to be celebrated, al these were put out of the Church, and none remained, but they who both were called, and also should be perfecti, persite. These at the begynning, and long after, when the Sacrifice was celebrated, in many places commonly vsed to communicate.

*Chrysost.
hom. 61. ad
popul. An-
tiochen.*

In S. Chrysostomes time, the heate of this deuotion slacked among many. Most receiued not the communion but at certaine high feastes, as S. Chrysostome him selfe saith, some thise, some twise, some but once in the yere, and some but once in two yeres. S. Ambros and S. Augustine said of the Brekes, and of them in the East, that they receiued our lordes body but once in the yere, as is before mentioned. To bring the people to this auncient deuotion againe, and to stirre them to receiue oftener, S. Chrysostome vsed this vehemencie of speache as out of the two foresaid homilies is by diuerse alleged. And because when the Deacon made his proclamation, come ye vp with faith and charitie and with the feare of God, they came, and yet receiued not: S. Chrysostome saith, that who so euer so came, and would not receiue, he was impudent and rash. And verely who so euer would at this day come to the place, where the blessed Sacrament is deliuered, and kneele downe, making resemblance to receiue, and yet would not receiue: worthily might he be rebuked, of impudencie and rashnes.

*Who are
they who
S. Chry-
sostom cal-
led impu-
dent and
rash.*

*M. Few
would ha-
ue vs dip-
ne at gods*

But syr where did euer S. Chrysostome speake thus to the people, If ye receiue not, departe ye from the Church?

Do

Do ye drine your congregations out of the Church, so oftentimes as they be not disposed to receiue your Communion? If S. Chrysostome did it, why do not ye folow him? If he did it not, why would ye haue me so to speake vnto the people? Surely he neuer spake it, and therefore you helpe him, where said he, that if the people receiue not at the Masse, they haue no more place there; then Turkes and Heathens? Merely this is too Turkish and too Heathenish a saying, for S. Chrysostome to haue uttered, who they are whose eyes be vnworthy to see these Mysteries, and eares to heare them, I haue declared before.

people out
of the
church,
that do
not receiue

M. Jew.
Turkish
and hea-
thenish
doctrine.

You would me to speake vnto the people, as S. Chrysostome spake, Our Masses can not profite you. why then did S. Chrysostome speake of Masses? You haue oftentimes denied it partly. If he dyd, we haue a witness more for the name of the Masse, then I was ware of. If he did not, then reposte you vntruly of him. Merely he neuer spake any such thing at al, as neither that which foloweth in your next sentence.

he maketh
S. Chrys-
ostome
speake of
Masses.

As for the thye last sayinges, The Masses please not God: they prouoke his anger: they are al in vaine: These are not S. Chrysostomes sayinges, they are M. Jewels cankred blasphemies, geuing witness of his perfite hatred against the Church of God. It had ben better he had neuer woyme thye ad, then to haue winded vp such a wicked Clewe.

M. Jew.
raileth out
wicked
blasphemy

Now good Reader: I pray thee looke once backe againe, and reade what M. Jewell saith in the beginning of this paragraph. There thou readest thus. If M. Harding wil stande vnto the authoritie of Chrysostome, let him not dissemble, but speake plainly vnto the people, as Chrysostome spake. This condition I accept with a good wil. Vnto the authoritie of S. Chrysostom I wil stand, neither wil I dissemble, but speake plainly as he spake. If I alter his wordes, it shal be litle, the sense I wil not alter at al.

Now I require M. Jewell to stande here vnto also as reason is.

A Reioindre to

And let the world iudge, (though rather had I that learned men should iudge) which is more agreeable to the Doctrine of S. Chrysostome, either the new Communion of England, or the Masse of the Catholike Church, which it pleaseth S. Iewel to call my Masse. For thereof is our consequencie.

Here is
plain spea-
king, as I
Chrysostom
speaketh
which S.
Jewel re-
quireth.
The real
presence.
Chryso-
som. 3.
ad Eph.
Ibidem.

First touching the truth and real presence of Christs body and blood, which we consecrate in the Masse, if I shal speake plainly, as S. Chrysostome speake, then thus must I speake.

This body is nothing different from that body, which was fastened vnto the Crosse, which was pearled with nailes, which was Sacrificed: Again. Who so euer of vs do participate of this bo-

dy, who so euer do taste this blood: consider ye, that we taste blood that sitteth aboue, that is adoured of the Angels, that vnto the immortal power. Item, if I wil speake plainly

Chrysostome speake; then must I thus speake vnto the people in the person of Christe. Volui frater vestire esse, Me-

ben to be your brother, for your sake haue I taken vnto me this body and blood. And to you now I deliuer the selfe same blood, by the which I became your cousin, or became

of your nature. Item, If the figure of this blood had so great vertue both in the Temple of the Hebrewes, and in Egypt, when the postes of the dores were therewith anointed: much more the

hath the truth. weigh wel this wayde, truth, reader, and thou shalt see, that the blood which we haue in the Sacrifice of the Church, is not a Figure, as the Sacramentaries make it, but in

comparison of the Figure of the slave lawe, the very truth. To conclude, here of I must say vnto the people with S. Chrysostome. His terrarum orbis est pretium, hoc Christus emit Ecclesiam. This is the price of the world, with this Christe hath

bought his Church.

This much is plainly spoken by S. Chrysostome touching the veritie of the body and blood of Christe in this blessed Sacrament.

Ad po-
pul, An-
ziochen.
hom. 61.
cognatus
vester
factus
sum.
Ibidem.

Ibidem.

Wherein the Doctrine of the English Communion is set forth
like to this, for thereby the people is taught the true body & blood
of Christ not to be here in dede, but the thinges that be layd up-
on their table, to be the creatures of bread and wine, and then to
be in dede but tokens, signes, and figures of the holy thinges.
What difference then is between the signe & figure of Christs flesh,
& the flesh it self, between bread and wine, and that precious body
and blood it selfe: so much odds there is between this new Do-
ctrine, and the Doctrine of S. Chrysostom, between the new Com-
munion, and his and our Masse.

Furthermoie to compare table with table, Isti mensæ ad-
stant angeli, ipse rex adest, at this table angels, do serve, the
him selfe, (that is to say Christe) is present, saith S. Chryso-
stom.

He saith moie over, the holy ghost commeth downe in-
to the table, through the holy thinges that be laid
upon the table. I trow M. Jewel him selfe wil not tel
the people, to thinke they should honour and worship Christe
present on the table of their Communion, that angels
waite upon the bread and wine: neither that the holy ghost coun-
meth downe vnto them through the creatures of bread and wine.

Now as S. Chrysostome, and we with him, do acknow-
ledge Christs body and blood herely present in the Sacraments,
so he confesseth that Christ is there by way of Sacrifice, and that
he is offered up in Sacrifice. For so he his plaine wordes, Profer-
tur Sacrificium, & Christus immolatur. The Sacrifice is brought
forth, and Christe is sacrificed.

In the beginning of his Masse, (as Cramus calleth his
Liturgie) he maketh his prayer to our Lorde, that he may stande
at the dreadfull altar without condemnation, and make the pure
Sacrifice. These Gospellers as they haue euerywhere destroyed
the altars, to wnder haue they any such Sacrifice at al.

The odds
between
our Masse
of S. Chry-
stomes
masse, and
the new
Communi-
on of
England.
Ad Ephe-
som. 3.

ibidem.

Christe is
sacrificed.

Chrysost.
ad popul.
Antioche.
hom. 61.

Chrysost.
in Liturg.

A Reioindre to

And let the world iudge, (though rather had I that learned men should iudge) which is more agreeable to the Doctrine of S. Chrysostome, either the new Communion of England, or the Masse of the Catholike Church, which it pleaseth *sa. Jewel* to call my Masse. For thereof is our controuersie.

First touching the truth and real presence of Christs body and blood, which we consecrate in the Masse, if I shal speake plainly, as S. Chrysostome spake, then thus must I speake.

This body is nothing different from that body, which was fastened vnto the Crosse, which was pearled with nailes, which was sacrificed: Again. Who so euer of vs do participate of this body, who so euer do taste this blood: consider ye, that we taste his blood that sitteth aboue, that is adoured of the Angels, that is nigh vnto the immortal power. Item, if I wil speake plainly as S.

Chrysostome spake, then must I thus speake vnto faithful people in the person of Christe. Volui frater vester esse, My wil hath ben to be your brother, for your sake haue I taken vnto me flesh and blood. And to you now I deliuer the selfe same flesh and blood, by the which I became your cousin, or became to be of your nature. Item. If the figure of this blood had so greates vertue both in the Temple of the Hebrewes, and in Egypt, when the postes of the dores were therewith anointed: much more the which the truth.

weigh wel this wayde, truth, reader, and thou shalt see, that the blood which we haue in the Sacrifice of the Church, is not a Figure, as the Sacramentaries make it, but in comparison of the Figure of the olde lawe, the very truth. To conclide, here of I must say vnto the people with S. Chrysostome. Hic terrarum orbis est pretium, hoc Christus emit Ecclesiam. This is the price of the worlde, with this Christe hath bought his Church.

This much is plainly spoken by S. Chrysostome touching the veritie of the body and blood of Christe in this blessed Sacrament.

Here is plain speaking, as f Chrysostom speaks which Jewel requirerh. The real presence. Chrysostom. hom. 3. ad Ephe. Ibidem.

Ad populum. Anzichen. hom. 61. cognatus vester factus sum. Ibidem.

Ibidem.

Whence the Doctrine of the English Communion is farre unlike to this, for thereby the people is taught the true body & blood of Christ not to be here in dede, but the thinges that be layd upon their table, to be the creatures of bread and wine, and them to be in dede but tokens, signes, and figures of the holy thinges. What difference then is between the signe & figure of Christs fleshy, & the fleshy it self, between bread and wine, and that precious body and blood it selfe: so much odds there is between this new Gospel, and the Doctrine of S. Chrysostome, between the new Communion, and his and our Masse.

Further more to compare table with table, I shew ad ministrant angeli, ipse rex adest, at this table angels do serue, the King him selfe, (that is to say Christe) is present, saith S. Chrysostome. He saith more over, the holy ghost commeth downe into vs. And so by consequence, through the holy thinges that be laid forth vpon the table. I shew M. Jewell himselfe, wil not tell the people, to thinke they should honour and worship Christe really present on the table of their Communion, that angels waite vpon the bread and wine: neither that the holy ghost commeth downe vnto them through the creatures of bread and wine.

Now as S. Chrysostome, and we with him, do acknowledge Christs body and blood hereby present in the Sacraments, so he confesseth that Christ is there by way of Sacrifice, and that he is offered vp in Sacrifice. For so be his plaine wordes. Proferatur Sacrificium, & Christus immolatur. The Sacrifice is brought forth, and Christe is Sacrificed.

In the beginning of his Masse, Co. Erasmus calleth his Liturgie, he maketh his prayer to our Lorde, that he may stande at the dreadfull altar without condemnation, and make the pure Sacrifice. These Gospellers as they haue euerywhere destroyed the altars, do wonder haue they any such Sacrifice at al.

The odds between our Masse of S. Chrysostomes masse, and the new Communion of England. Ad Ephes. rom. 3. Ibidem.

Christe is sacrificed.

Chrysost. ad popul.

Antiochē.

rom. 6.

Chrysost. in Liturg.

A Reioindre to

In Liturg.
The cere-
monies of
S. Chrys-
ostomes
Masse be-
sed by the
Greekes at
this daye.

S. Chrysostome vseth at his Masse such Ceremonies, as if he were now lyuing, he were like to be scoffed at of all. He wel, and accompted for a superstitious Papist of the rest. He kisseth the table foure times in forme of a Crosse, he taketh a linnen vestiment with his right hande, he kisseth and blesseth it: Then he putteth on his Stole, his girdle, and his pall, at euery one making a feneal and special prayer.

S. Chrys-
ostom com-
mendeth
him selfe
and the
people to
god throu-
gh the pray-
ers of our
Lady and
all other
Saintes.

At his Masse he commendeth himself and the people to god through the prayers of Saintes, saying thus. Haue mercie, and saue vs O Lorde for the prayers of her, that brought thee forth Gods Mother, euermore virgin Marie, of al the holy spiritual powers, of thy pretious Prophete, forerunner and Baptiste Iohn, of thy holy glorious Apostles, and of S. Nicolas, whose memorie we celebrate.

The like memorie he maketh there, desiring God to helpe for the prayers of his Saintes, and specially of the blessed virgin Mary, alwaies calling her Deipara, seuen or eight times. Precibus sanctorum serua nos. Kepe vs (saith he) by, for, or through the prayers of Saintes. In one place he saith the Aue Maria, that our new Gospellers set so litle by. Haile Marie ful of grace, our Lord is with thee, blessed arte thou among women, and blessed is the fruite of thy wombe: because thou hast brought forth the Saviour of our soules.

*The Aue
Maria.*

*Prayer
vnto our
Lady S.
Marie.*

He prayeth also vnto our Lady and praiseth her, saying. It is a worthy and a lust thing to glorifie thee the mother of God, euermore most blessed, and the viterly vndefiled mother of our God, more honorable then Cherubin, and incomparably more glorious then Seraphin, who broughtest forth God without corruption.

*Prayer for
the dead.*

He prayeth at sundry times for the dead, desiring God to remember them; and for the same also he offereth. He putteth wine

wine into the Chalice, saying thus, And one of the souldiers opened his side, and forthwith issued out bloud. And when he minglcth therto the water, he saith, And water, and he that saw it hath borne witnesse of it, and his witnesse is true.

Mingling
of water
and wyne.

Then he offereth incense. Light is borne before the priest hearing the Gospel. The priest turneth vnto the Image of Christe. The Deacon readeth the Epistle, geuing warning whose Epistle it is, saying, the Epistle of S. Paule. Then after a psalme song, the Deacon stouperth downe, and the priest prayeth ouer him, beseeching God to geue utterance vnto tellers of the glad tidings with much power, throughe the prayers of our Lady, Gods mother, and euer virgin Marie; and the holy and glorious Apostle, and Euangeliste, whose gospel is read.

Incense,
light, the
image of
Christ.

Concerning the rest of S. Chrysostomes Masse, what prayers are made, much like (though more in number) to the prayers of the Latine Masse, for al states, both quicke and dead, how the body and bloud of Christe are consecrated, how reuerently and with deuoute manner they are adoured, and incensed, how the blessed Sacramentes are lifted vp and shewed vnto the people, how the hoste is broken, and parte of it put into the Chalice; how lightes be hanged vp before the Sacramentes, how the Deach calleth vp the people to come and receiue the Communion, and how in the end they are dimitted with the priestes blessing, to declare al this at large, it were ouer long. Vnderly most thinges are donne agreably to the Latine Masse, whereof the ministracion of this new deuised Communion hath not so much as a shadow.

Dozatio,
lifting vp
and shew-
ing of the
Sacra-
mentes,
lightes &c.

Thus this matter is to be tolde, if we stand to the authoritie of S. Chrysostome, and speake plainly as S. Chrysostom spake, which M. Jewel requireth. wherby the catholike Doctrine touching the Masse, is in euery point auouched and confirmed: and

FF. ii. the

A Rejoinder to

the new deuise of the English Communion is quite discredited:
The thing is plaine, w^h has neede many wordes.

Whereby it appeareth clearly what a Turkish and Heathen
misharte M^r. Jewel hath, in that he would haue me speake vnto
the people that resort deuoutly vnto the Masse, say, they haue
no moze place there, then the Turkes and Heathens. A trust
good people, and al such as shal vnderstand, how falsly he hath
fathered this wicked doctrine vpon S. Chrysostome, wil beleue
him herein so farre as Turkes and Heathens the enemies of
God are to be beleued, Verely there is no Turke or Heathen so
to be feared, as a minister of such Turkish doctrine. For wher-
as the Turkes at the bittermost caⁿ but destroy our bodies, these
Turkish ministers destroy both bodies and soules eternally:
Good Reader it shal be holesome for thee to beleue S. Chryso-
stome himselfe, who teacheth the doctrine concerning the most
blessed Sacrifice of the Masse, that the holy Ghoste hath taughte
the Catholike church, which also we teach: and not to beleue M^r.
Jewel, or any of his companions scholars of Caluines wicked
schoule, whose study and endeuour is to withdraue thee from the
olde faith and religion that S. Chrysostom and al holy Fathers
sith the Apostles time professed, and bring thee vnto their vncer-
taine nouelties by them selues not agreed vpon, which if thou
yeldest vnto, and remaine therein impenitent, at the end thy part
shalbe with Turkes and Heathens. God geue the grace not to
trust to lies.

Jewel.

The 109. Now let vs examine this inuincible Argument, vvhether with euery
Untruth. childe, as M. Harding vaunteth, as able to proue the Private Masse.
I say o- The Maior is this: The Sacrifice in Chrysostomes time vvas daily offered.
therwise. The Minor is this: But many times no man came to communicate with
Looke in my booke. the Priest: The Conclusion, Ergo, there vvas private Masse.

Harding.

Harding.

Will you neuer repute my wordes truly? As to *Adina*, what so euer he touched it became golde: so what so euer *M. Jewel* taketh in hande, I see wel, it shalbe falsified. But of al other your infinite falsifyinges, this is one of the least. I haunt not, as you say, that with this argument every childe is able to proue private Masse. But say I in that place, Of this most euident place of *S. Chrysostome*, every childe is hable to make an innuincible argument against *M. Jewel* for the private Masse, as they cal it, in this sorte.

By repute of *S. Chrysostome*, the Sacrifice in his time was daily offered, that is to say, the Masse was celebrated. But many times nobody came to Communicate Sacramentally with the Priestes, as it is before proued: Ergo there were Masses donne without others receiuing the Sacrament with the Priestes? Ergo, private Masses (being taken for the Priest sole receiuing) in *S. Chrysostomes* daies were not stragg, Now what answer you to this argument?

Iouel.

* Here the Maior is apparent false.

* The Minor proued at aduertures onely by blinde gheasse, and so not proued at al. Therefore the Conclusion must needs so lye after as it may. Onlesse *M. Harding* looke better to it, I trovy it yvil proue but a childish argument.

The. 110. Truth. The Maior is *S. Chrysostomes*, to whose verities *M. Jewel* hath promised to stande.

The. 211. Truth. The Minor likewise is *S. Chrysostomes*, as here it is shewd.

M. Jewel falsified al that he taketh in hande.

Pag. 31. a.

This is my argument there.

Harding.

Why say you not being so olde a one as you are, that the argument may be good, though the antecedent be false?

F. H. 114.

This

A Reioindre to

This Argumēt is not to be blamed, being such as may easily be brought into the forme of a persite syllogismus. But the Maior (you say) is apparent false. You say so, but you proue it not. Saying so, you deny the Doctours, to whose iudgement you haue promised to stand, and by whose verditte you haue offered your Challenge to be tried. For prouise of the Maior, S. Chrysostome saith, *ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἑωρῶμεν*, the daily Sacrifice is in vaine. If it were daily in vaine, then was it daily. If it were not daily, then neither was it daily in vaine. *Omni die populus immolatur*, Chyriste is sacrificed for the people euery day, saith S. Augustine. Epist. 23.

Chrysost.
ad Ephes.
hom. 3.

The Minor is proued by the plaine wordes of S. Chrysostome. *οὐδὲν ἵερον ἔστιν*. There is none that receiveth, saith he. If there were none that receiued with the Priest, then the Priest, as of necessitie he was bounde, receiued the Oblation alone. And so was that done which you cal private Masse. That others receiued with the Priest, as Deacons and Priestes, when the people refused, or some of the people, when the Deacons and Priestes refused: that is your blinde gheasse M. Jewel and seely coniecture, contrary to the plaine wordes of S. Chrysostome. The conclusion therfore soloweth wel ynough, and according to the rules of Logique,

Ieruel.

The. 112.
vnttruth.
S. Bugu-
line hath
the con-
trarie.
Canon. 52.
Aug. tract.
26. Concil.
Laodicea.
Can. 49.

As for the Maior it is plaine by the sixth Council of Constantinople, by S. Augustine vpon S. Iohn, by S. Basil Ad Casariam Patriciam, by the Epistle of the Council of Alexandria in the defence of Macarius, and by the Council holden at Laodicea, and by sundry other auctorities to that purpose before alleged, that the Sacrifice was not daily offered, as M. Harding imagineth.

Harding.

This is answered before in the. 12. Diuinitie, Your three Coun-
cels

A Reioindre to

But what neede is there to heape here together testimonies
for the daily Sacrifice, such that al the auncient Fathers writin-
ges minister them to the diligent reader almost in euery place.
Let vs therefore briefly conclude with the witness of S. Ciprian,
Cypri. li. 1.
epist. 2. who saith, Nos Sacerdotes Sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus,
we that be priests do celebrate the Sacrifices of God daily.
And so haue you good authoritie for that the Sacrifice was daily
offred, which you denye,

Ieruel

The. 213.
vnto truth.
W. Har-
ding could
not say &
an f. Chry-
sostome,
which is
not in him
to be sene.
W. Ieruel.
deliteth
in a vaine
toy of his
fio body.
Touching the Minor, it is not proued, but hangereth, as I haue said, onely
by gheasse. * M. Harding him selfe saue, that this is but a slender proufe.
Chrysostome ministred euery day, ergo, he receiued alone. And there-
fore he sought further to finde his Single Communion in the Countrey.
But Chrysostome saith, There is no body to communicate. By this it may
appeare, as I haue already said, that Chrysostome him selfe did not com-
municate: onlesse we wil say, Chrysostome was No body: and so
No body receiued alone: and No body him selfe said M. Hardinges private
Masse. And therefore No body may come forth, and iustly require me to
subscribe. Thus the Maior being false, the Minor not proued,
the conclusion not following, thou seest good Christian reader,
what inuincible force M. Harding hath brought to proue his
Masse.

Harding

What this man lacketh in truth and reason, he supplieth
with wordes. And that wordes should not be tedious, he saw-
reth them with scoffes. Such of the audience perhaps may be
please, who haue more delight to heare Dickelcorner vpon the sta-
ge, then to consider the profitable diffe of the mater. The equino-
is proued by the credite of S. Chrysostome, whose worde is
plaine, there is none to receiue. The disproufe of it hangereth al to-
gether by gheasse,

Reicher

Neither sawe I this prouise to be seclender, Chrysostome mis-
mistred euerie day, ergo, he receiued alone: for I neuer sawe it at
all. It may be an argument of some Minister, verely myne it is
not. Neither meaneth S. Chrysostome whers he speaketh of that
standing at the altar in vaine, onely of him selfe, but also of o-
ther priestes in his time indifferently, and therfore he speaketh in
the plural number, we stand. But when I sawe S. Chrysostome,
by his owne reporte, to offer the Sacrifice, and to stand at
the altar, looking for others to come and receiue, whē none came
for so signified his worde o'is: then sawe I the prouise good
and sufficient, that he receiued alone.

o'is
nullus,
none, or
not one.

The whole commeth to this issue, whether we shal beleue S.
Chrysostome him selfe, who saith, there was none to communi-
cate, when the sacrifice was offered, or M. Jewel, that saith, there
were others to communicate. Now if S. Chrysostome be a man
rather to be beleued, then M. Jewel, who is so notoriously kno-
we to halte: then is not the Single Communion or sole recei-
uing founde only in the Countrey, whereof he teacheth, but also
in the great Cities of Antioche, and Constantinople, as befoze
we founde it in Carthage, and Alexandria, in Millan, and by
great probabilitie in Rome, which are the greatest and most
famous Cities of the worlde.

The sin-
gle Com-
munion is
founde in
great Ci-
ties.

pag. 17. b.
18 b. 21. b.
20. a.

Among other bad shifts that M. Jewel is dyuen vnto for
aboiding this place, he useth this for one, that, soasmuch as S.
Chrysostome saith there is no body to communicate, he would it
by this to appeare, that S. Chrysostome him selfe did not com-
municate. But this shift is the worst of all others. For both
in all such speeches, not to except the person of him that spea-
keth, it is beside reason: And in this case not to except the
person of S. Chrysostome, or of whom so euer he meant, it is be-
side learning. For where as he confesseth a sacrifice offered, & to y-
eude a priestes standing at the altar: we must vnderstand there

The ex-
ception that
M. Jewel
maketh of
S. Chry-
stomes
owne per-
son to vai-
ne, beside
learning,
and reason.

Sacrifices
alwaies
requireth
to be receiuing.

A Reioindre to

*Conc. Tolet
can. 12. c. 7*

1. Cor. 10

to be included the receiuing. The fathers of the twelfth Toletane Councel excommunicated al priests, that presumed to offer the holy Sacrifice of the aulter, and forbore to receive the Communion. For what manner a sacrifice is that (say they) whereof neither he him selfe that sacrificeth. is partaker? Thereof in that Councel we finde this expresse doctrine, which there they proue by the wordes of S. Paule to the Corinthians. Omnibus modis est tenendum, vt quotiescunque sacrificans corpus & sanguinem Iesu Christi Domini nostri in altario immolat, toties perceptionis corporis & sanguinis Christi se participem præbeat. By al meanes this is to be kepte, that how oftentimes so euer the priest doth sacrifice the body and bloud of Iesus Christe our lordes on the aulter, so oftentimes he receiue, and make him selfe partaker of the body and bloud of Christe. And further. It is certaine (saith that Councel) that they, who doing sacrifice do not eate thereof, be gyly of our lordes Sacrament. wherfore if M. Jewel wil haue it appeare, because S. Chrysostome said, there is none to receiue, that neither S. Chrysostome him selfe receiued: then must he shewe vs, that he offered no Sacrifice. And that can not he doo, for expressely he witnesseth the Sacrifice. Otherwise the excepting of his person from receiuing the Communion, standeth not with the graunting of his Oblation, according to learning.

Via.

It may appeare, that Chrysostome him selfe. did not Communicate, saith M. Jewel, unless we say, Chrysostome was No body: and so No body receiued alone: and No body him selfe said M. Hardinges priuate Masse. And therefore No body may come forth, and iustly require me to subscribe, To dally thus vpon No body in so graue a matter, I doubt, whether it become any body. Though Wilkes, as homere & poete faineth, vpo good policie named hi selfe Vtis, as much to say, No body, vnto Polyphemus & cruel Gyant: yet is it:

it not seemely for a Divine & amirist of the word, to bestow such a nickename upon the holy Father S. Chrysostome. But let vs leane to this Replier such toys, least if we take them from him, we plucke from him his fairest feathers.

Now if for his sake, to maintaine his mery point, we will not say, that S. Chrysostome was No body: then is he put to silence, and al the spoite is dashed. Let then S. Chrysostome be as he was, Some body. If we say so, then Some body received alone, and Somebody him selfe said private Masse. And therefore Somebody may now come forth and iustly require this mery body to subscribe. Thus the Maior being true, the Minor proued by chaffirmation of S. Chrysostom, the Conclusion of the premisses by right Logique folowing, thou seest Christian Reader, how weakly this Argument is answered.

Ieruel.

But because he seemeth to set somevbat by the vinding, y^e of his Clew, it shal not be from the purpose, to vindinge it againe, and to lay it abroad, and to consider the fluffing of it, and to see howv wisely and handsomly it is wound together.

Harding.

This Clew that you haue neuer done withal, is of thread of your owne spinning: as for me, I neither made any, nor spake at al of any. If you had good mater ynough for disprouf of the Catholique doctrine, you should not haue neded to spend so many idle wordes in pursuing such a light toy. Now let vs see your vntwinding, wherin I suppose you are prompter then in winding together: for the profession of your Gospel is, to loose and vntwinde, what Christe, and the Apostles, and their successors these 1600. yeares haue bounde and wounde together.

Ieruel.

First there is not one thread of the holy Scriptures in al this Clew.

GGg ij.

but:

A Reioindre to

but the plaine example of Christ and the Apostles quite refused.

Harding.

Irenaus. If you meane by this Clew my Answer to the first Article
lib. 4. c. 32. of your vaine Challenge, as it seemeth you do: for \S Consecration
and the vnbloody Oblation of the body and blood of our Lorde,
we haue the Institution of Christ, who taught the new Oblation
of the new testament, which the Church tooke of the Apostles,
and offereth the same to God through the whole worlde, as \S .
Irenens saith. This Oblation I haue proued by Scriptures,
the Institution of Christ, who said Do ye this in my remembrance,
by the example of the Apostles, and the general doctrine of the
Fathers. And more amply hereafter it shal be proued.

Leuel.

Secondly the priuate Masse is founded vpon the negligence, and as
M. Harding calleth it the vnderminion of the people.

Harding.

The Consecration and Oblation, is founded vpon Christs
Institution, practised by the Apostles, and continued by the
Church. That the people many times receiveth not with the
Priest, it is not a thing positive, and therefore properly to speake,
it is not founded. Priuate Masse being taken for the Sacrifice
of the Church we acknowledge none. The Priest that offereth,
is bound to receiue. The people be not alwaies bound to receiue
with him. If lacking companie he receiue alone, thereby Chri-
stes Institution of his part is not broken. If the people be here-
in negligent and vnderminion, the more grievous is their offence.

Leuel.

The. 214. Thirdly, there is a way deuised, howe many Priests saying their Masses
vntruth. in diuerse Countries, may communicate together in breaking bread, be the
It is not distance betwene them neuer so great, and that without any manner vnan-
said that in breaking bread, this
g. priests terme is
in sundry here falsly
places do conveyed
communicate
eate toge-
ther in
breaking
bread, this
terme is
here falsly
conveyed
in.

Harding.

Harding.

Your terme of Breaking Breaðe is suspitious, what you meane thereby we know not. But for as much as many that do partecipe of one breað, that is to say, of the body of Christ, and of one cuppe, to witte, of the blood of Christe worthily, be made one breað and one body, as S. Paul saith: not onely two 1. Cor. 10. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

Iayrol.

Fourthly, Lais people, wremen, sicke folkes, and boyes, that receined or ministred the Sacrament alone, * are brought in for this purpose: as though it had ben lawfull for wremen or boyes to say Masse.

Harding.

This replie of boyes is very boyish, and yet very common in al your first Article. An example in my boke is alleged, where a lad is sent to the priest to come and minister the blessed Sacrament to Herapion lying at the point of death. The priest him selfe being very sicke, and not able to come, sendeth the Sacrament by the lad. which is wel allowed by S. Dionysius of Alexandria, and recorded by Eusebius, but this Replier scoffeth much at it. That lay people, wremen, and sicke folkcs, have receined the Sacrament alone, examples have been alleged: yet thereby it is not made lausful, that wremen and boyes should say Masse, as your boyish scoffing pretendeth. But if it were lawfull for them to receine alone, why shew you not some good reason, why a priest may not receine alone, whose sole receining, you tal private Masse?

The. 115. Untruth. They are not brought in to this purpose, as is sufficiently declared, but to prove sole receiving

Engeb. Eccles. hist. lib. 6. c. 34.

A Reioindre to

Ieruel.

The. 216.
vnt ruth.
That al
be not of
doubteful
credite, I
haue suffi-
ciently pro-
ued, as
now it is
evident.
Basil &
Chrysost.
in Litur-
gies.

Fifthly, because S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Hierome, S. Chrysostome, S. Basil, and such others would not serue, there is brought in a great number of pety Doctors, *al of doubtful credite, and many of them long since misliked, and condemned by the Church.

Harding.

For the Sacrifice I haue brought the Testimonies and authorities of S. Basil, and of S. Chrysostome. The rest that you name, I might haue brought, as you may iudge by this treatise. Many other good and aunient Fathers I brought in, whose authority and estimation you haue donne what you could to decrease, but al in vaine. Therein you haue shewed your impudent malapertnesse, their same and worshippe you haue caused the more to be knowen. Neither were they condemned by the Church, as you belye the Church.

Ieruel.

Sixthly, the mater is made good by Visions, *dreames and fables.

Harding.

The. 217.
vnt ruth,
I auouch
not this
mater by
visions &
dreames
Neither
be visions
& dreames
one thing.
Ioan. 20.

Dreames, and fables my booke hath none. One Vision of S. Basil it reporteth, auouched by that appeared to me good authority. If your incredulous harte can beleue no visions, I can not say vnto you, as Christe said vnto S. Thomas, *Inle digittum tuum huc*: Come and put in thy finger hither. Albeit if that Vision moue you not, there is other proufe ynough for the Masse, beside the intallible tradition of the Church, which you ought to beleue.

Ieruel.

Senemhly there are alleged Canons of Councils not extant in any Council gathered without great iudgement by one Gratian, and yet none of them neither prouing, nor once naming the Priuate Masse.

Harding.

Harding.

This is meant of the 47. Canon of the Councel of Agatha. Though the booke of Semlak, which was Peter Crabbes copie to the Bpinte, had not this, as also certaine other Canons, yet in other booke that Gratian had, might haue had it. This is answered before. Here I must warne the Reader of your craft, when you be not hable to answere manifestt place brought against you, the best shifte you haue is, to denye the author. No man alledge Gratian more then your selfe; though to litle purpose: but when ought that is in Gratian maketh against you, and is contrary to any parte of your Gospel, then is Gratian a man of litle judgement, and of light anctozitie. This vantage you vsurp ouer vs, to allow, and disallow, whom, and what you list; to binde vs to the writers of the first six hundred yeres, and your selfe to make your market the best you can, of al that euer wrote from S. Mathew to Cassander, that at these dayes writeth partly on your side, and partly on our side, whom ye allege, and we reppone.

*M. J. chas-
clo crat
and shift.*

An other false caske that you vse much, is this. There is but one boy here mentioned, and to good purpose: and you to make the mater more odious, name boyes: but one Vision, you name visions, Dreames, and fables: one Canon of one Councel, that Peter Crabbes Copie had not, and you speake of Canons of Councels. wel may your Rhetorique teach you this, verely the holy Scriptures haue not so taught you. whereas you say, the Canons I haue alleged, proue not, nor once name the Spinate Masse: they both proue and name the Masse, and that is ynough. If they name not Spinate Masse, no wagnel, the terme, as you take it, is a newe founde deuile of your first E-angeliste Martin Luthers schoole. If we finde it not in the olde fathers, take not of it, we seeke not for it, nor looke

Shb i.

to

A Rejoinder to

to finde it much in the new writers, that be Catholike. It is a
 whole to angling to require a new deuised terme in old writers.
 You haue the thing, what can you aske more? What I deny
 and put any man to proue, that there was bread eate within the
 first six hundred yeres, because this English terme bread can not
 in al the writers of that age be founde. It is a roke you are ouer-
 come in the water, when thus ye stande upon the terme.

The. 118.

Truth,
 These ci-
 ties be pet-
 turre with
 in halfe a
 100. miles
 of christen
 dome, and
 at tyme
 were prin-
 cipal par-
 tes, and as
 it were the
 harte of
 christendome.

100. Jew.
 together
 his owne
 Chalfe,
 & semeth
 so make
 exception
 of certayne
 Cities &
 Countreys.

Eighly because M. Harding could not finde his Masse in the whole
 Church of Rome, vntill he had the space of six hundred yeres after Christe, he
 hath therefore made search at Alexandria in Egypte, at Antioche in Syria,
 at Caesarea in Cappadocia, * a thousand myles beyond the limits of
 Christendome, whereas vntill neuer priuate Masse said, neither then, nor
 before that tyme, nor neuer substance.

Harding.

Why was not your Challenge general? Did you craue
 the landes of Egypte, Syria, and Cappadocia? Did you not
 make your Proclamation of any one example of the primitive
 Church? And in the time of the primitive Church, where flo-
 shed the faith more, then at Alexandria, where S. Marks the E-
 uangeliste, then at Antioche, where S. Peter him self preached
 the Gospel, and founded the Churches? Celarea in the time of
 length, specially in the time of S. Basil, became it not to be a fa-
 mous Church? Neither were these great Cities in the time of
 the first six hundred yeres within the limits of Christendome,
 but rather a thousand myles within the limits of Christendome.
 And at this day Alexandria is neare, and Antioche is as it were
 a neighbour vnto the lande of Egypte, which is a parte of Egi-
 ptendome: and Celarea is not very farre off.
 If you disallow the Masse, because it is founde to haue been
 used

held in place now farre distant from Christendome: by late as-
suming you may disallow the acts of Christ, his baptisme, his
resurrection, and Ascension, and that ye ministers talk
to much of the Supper of the Lord & selfe: For al these be found
to have ben done in the land of Iordam, and Jerusalem, that
are now further from the boundes of Christendome, then Anti-
oche is. At other times you like any Church better then the
Church of Rome: yet now because for witness of the Masse I
referre not to referre the reader huto it: you finde fault for not al-
ligning the example of the Church of Rome. So that your tra-
uall is not so much to finde the truth, as to finde some occasion
of fault against me. Of al other your light deuils uttered by
you against the Sacrifice of the Church, this was the fondest.
So much the lesse, you should haue uttered it as Dauides Crosse.
For thereby what did you els, but make al the world witness of
your foolishnesse? For wel it is known, though Alexandria,
Antioche, and Cesarea, be not now partes of Christendome, yet
within the first six hundred yeres, they were of the chiefe mem-
bers of al Christendome.

A most
fons deuill
of ad.
Iewel.

Jerusalem.
Nienthy, for that, he stood in despaire of Cathedral and other like
great Churches, he hath sought out Chappels, Celler, Oratories, and primate
houses: and because he had no hope to finde them in Townes, or Cities, he hath
sought out the little Churches in the countie.

Harding.
If your mynde was to exclude them, why did you not ex-
clude them in your Challenge? You shew your selfe now not to
haue made your Challenge wisely. And if I pray you, what not
the father of the first six hundred yeres, be accounted

The. 119.
vntut.
I haue
proued
that massa
was cele-
brated
both in
the
Churches
in great
Cities, as
here it is
eident.

305.

an olde Father, because upon some good occasion be said Masse in a Chappel, or Oratorie? Is Sole receiuing of the blessed Sacrament no Sole receiuing, because it was in private houses? Is the Masse proued no Masse, because it was celebrated in Churches of lesse frequencie, then Cathedral Churches be? And yet for them also, what make you of the Churches of Antioche, and Constantinople? were they not Cathedral? were they not great Churches? Rome excepted, were there euer any greater? How out of two Homilies of S. Chrysostome, we haue proued that there was Masse said, and that without a compaune receiuing with the Priest, you haue now sene. And touching the testimonie of Leontius reposing the Masse of S. Iohn the Baptist without Communicantes, will you say, the great Citie of Alexandria was no Towne, but a countrie village?

Tenthly, notwithstanding all this inquirie, he hath not yet founde
neither the name of private Masse, nor any priest that ever ministered; and
received alone.

If it be proued to haue been de iure, what skillerth it, whether it be proued, that it was done also de facto? particular factes, specially particular circumstances of factes, be not commonly written. The Masse we haue founde, and single Communion we haue founde, and the Priest also that hath offered the Sacrifice without others receiuing the Sacrament with him, we haue founde. As for the name of private Masse, how could it be found in any ancient writer, tith it is a new inuention of Luther? I meane, for thence the Sacrifice cannot be private. The thing then being founde, we haue no colour of reason, in that so busily we call for the name. Remember you not, what S. Augustine saith to

Howe
 Jewel
 bringeth
 his Cha-
 longe to
 the bare
 name of
 Mynde
 Mynde,
 there he
 were best
 to holde
 him, for
 thing he
 seeth pro-
 ned.

Is this a profession of the Arians heresie? Quid est con-
fessionis, quoniam ubi de eo constat, certare de nomine. 2. What is
made contentious; then where is the thing is certaine, to strive
about the name?

Augustin.
Epi. 174.

To be shorte, the whole substance of his proues hangeth onely upon
his owne surmise, without any veritie for appareance of a such
Harding.

He saith so, that is disposed to say any thing, rather then to
subscribe. He that duly considereth the proues, thinketh o-
therwise.

Ieruel.

These be the contentes of M. Hardinges Cleve, and thus substantially
hath he proued the antiquitie, and vniuersalitie of his Masse.

Harding.

The tope of your Cleve I leaue to you, make of it what you
list. The antiquitie of the Masse is proued, because I shewe
that it was within the first six hundred yeres after Christe. The
vniuersalitie of it, I was not moued to proue, by the purpose of
your Challenge. As he is said that Christe taught the new Ob-
lation of the new Testament, and the Church receiued it of the
Apostles, & offered it up vnto God in vniuerso mundo, through
the whole worlde, as S. Irenaeus saith: there is no cause, that
being the Masse wherein that Oblation is made, why any man
should doubt, whether it were vniuersall or no.

Irenaeus
lib. 4.

cap. 32.

The Masse:
hath ben
vniuersal-
ly vsed
through
all the
worlde.

What so euer the Apostles receiued of Christe, the same did
the Church receiue of them vniuersally. This new Oblation of
the new Testament, (which is that we make in the Masse, and
whereof the Masse chiefly consisteth) they receiued of Christe, as
S. Irenaeus saith: Ergo, the Church receiued the new Obla-
tion of the new Testament of the Apostles vniuersally.

BBB ii.

BB?

A Rejoindre to

By this terme universally, I understand not every particular member of the Church, but every age and place, when and where by the Apostles, and their successors Churches were planted. And thus is proved, not onely the antiquitie, but also the universalitie of the new Oblation of the new Testament, and consequently the Masse. For that new Oblation which Christ made at his last Supper, and taught his Apostles is that thing which chiefly we understand by the name of the Masse.

M. Jewels Conclusion of this Article.

Jewel.

NOW good Reader, to give thee only a taste of some part, that may be said of our side, first it is apparent, that Christ our Saviour at his last Supper Ministred the holy Communion, and no private Masse, and bad his Disciples to do the same in his remembrance.

Harding.

Thou knowest Reader, the manner of Shearmongers is, the rather to allure byers unto them, to set their best peeces for shew in the upper part of their shawers, and when any byer cometh to geve him for a taste of the better sort. The like policie here he secth M. Jewel. He bringeth forth the piousnes of his doctrine, as if were summer fruit to a market, that is soone ripe, soone rotten. And here setting forth to the eye his chiefe shew, he sheweth thee a taste of his best wize that he is able to make. Other foolishly and rotten fruit he seemeth to have, whereof he would make shew, were not for feare it should offende, and marre the whole sale.

That thou be not deceived, remember, his part is to prove, that within the first vi. C. yeres after Christ, any priest might not offer the new Oblation of the new Testament (as S. Hieronimus speaketh)

speake) which Christ taught his Apostles, that is to say, might
not celebrate Masse at any time: except he had a companion to re-
ceive the blessed Sacrament with him. If he prove not this, he
proove nothing contrary to the Doctrine herein and tradition
of the whole Catholike Church. And if he prove this substantial-
ly and clearly, then is he worthy to be heard. The matter being so
weighty, reason would, nothing be attempted against so auncient,
so universal, and so long continued an observation: unless the
proofes be very manifest and such as can not be refuted. Let
us then examine the case, which he groundeth upon commendatio,
as the best and chief of the whole heape.

First, Christ (saith he) at his last Supper *Ministred the holy
Communion, and no private Masse, and bad his Disciples to do the same in
his remembrance.* What meane you M. Jewell by these wordes,

Ministred the holy Communion? Make you Christ our Sanctus one
of your Ministers? who ever spake so before you? where found
you this phrase in al the Scriptures of the New or olde Testa-
ment, or in al the writings of the olde Fathers? Lett wordes is
found a part, I denie not, but where is this very speech to be
found? I thought you thus to begile the unlearned people, and to
bring your new devised Communion into estimation, by bearing
them in hand, that Christ ministred the holy Communion. And for
that policie was it thought good to print the first letter of your
worde ministred with a great M, that so your lewd Ministers
might seem to practise that, whiche Christ did? No, No, No.
Jewell, you and your Genevaian Ministers be farre from solow-
ing Christs example and commandement. Albeit I grante,
in a right sense it may be conceived, howe Christ at his last Su-
per ministred the holy Communion, but in you the worde is sus-
picious.

Because the denie of your Ministering liketh you well, you
say,

I take of
M. Jew-
ells chief
reasons as
gainst the
Masse.

M. Jew.
beth a
new and
suspicious
phrase.

Wh. 119.

say.

A Reioindre to

Luthers
wicked in
tent in de-
nising the
terme of
p̄uate
Masse af-
ter his
own sense.

say, that Christe ministred no p̄uate Masse: as though this
terme p̄uate Masse (in the sense that you take it to be of) were
not a monster of Luthers owne begetting. wherby he sought to
abrogate the external Sacrifice of the Church, and euerie sole
receiuing of the blessed Sacrament. The Masse, as I haue be-
fore said, touching the Oblation and Sacrifice, is not, ne can not
be p̄uate, as neither Christes death is, or can be p̄uate. The
Communion also, that is to say, Christes fleshy wherby we be
incorporate and vnited vnto him, and within our selues, is pos-
sible can not be made p̄uate: the receiuing of the Communion
may be p̄uate, single, or sole of one faithful person in respect
of place.

The sub-
stance of
the Masse
considered
according
to Chri-
stes exam-
ple of the
Supper.

But forasmuch as the Masse is impugned by the example of
Christes Supper: let vs consider, what Christ did at his Sup-
per, and what is that, he had his disciples do in his remembrance.
If that which we do in the Masse, be that which Christe did, and
commaunded to be done at his Supper: then is the Masse not
onely not impugned, but confirmed and made good by Christes
example at the Supper. Christ then at his Supper, as S. Ire-
neus gathering the whole storie thereof into a briefe summe writeth,
toke the creature of bread, (or y^e which by creation is bread,) and
gaue thanks saying: This is my body. And the cuppe likewise,
that is of a creature, which is with vs, he confessed to be his blood,
and taught the newe Oblation of the new Testament, which the
Church receiued of the Apostles, and offereth it to God through
the whole worlde.

Irenæus.
lib. 4.
cap 32.

Now as the Church by report of that holy Martyr, who li-
ued in the Apostles Scholers time, receiued this new Oblation
of the new testamēt of the Apostles, & offered it vnto god through
the whole world: so we y^e are p̄iestes now continue the same, as
Christ taught y^e Apostles, as the Apostles deliuered to y^e Church,

as the Church hath observed, and alwaies practised to these times. That is to say, we take bread, we blesse, we geue thanks, we make the Eucharist (for so the woorde is taken of *In Apolo- S. Iustine*, and other the moste auncient Fathers) we Consecrate the body of Christe, with and by the power of our Lordes owne worde which is workeful, as *S. Ambrose* calleth it, saying in the person of Christe, This is my body. Likewise we take the cuppe of wine mingled with water, we geue thanks, and speaking the woorde of Christe, we make and Consecrate by vertue of the same woorde, his precious Bloud, that bloud which issued out of his side, saith *S. Chrysostome*. And thus we the publike Ministers of the Church in this behalfe, geue, sende, and offer vnto God an Holie or Sacrifice of his owne gistes which he gaue vnto vs, the most precious of al that we can geue, and most acceptable vnto him.

This heauenly bread in the forme of common bread, for signification of Mysterie we breake, and distribute also vnto others hauing examined and proued them selues. which we neuer denie vnto such, when so euer they require it, or shew them selues desirous of it. If none of the people at sundry times finde them selues disposed, or so as it becometh, prepared, the same notwithstanding for any notorious crime not being excommunicate, we admitte vnto the Communion of prayer, of peate, of holy bread (for so many Communions be commended vnto vs, beside the Communion of the most high Mysteries) and suffer them to be present at the celebration of the Sacrifice, and the Priest in that case receiveth the holy Mysteries alone.

And al this is donne vpon warrant of Christes woordes, who said, Do ye or make ye this in my remembrance. The *Luc. 22. Bishop* (saith *S. Dionysius*, *S. Baules* scholer) excuseth him *1. Cor. 11.*

A Reioindre to

Dionysius
Eccles. Hi-
erarch. p. 1
cap. 3.

helfe that he taketh vpon him to sacrifice this helthful Sacrifice, that is so farre aboue his worthinesse, in seemly manner crying out vnto him; thou hast spoken the worde, Do ye this in my remembrance. As touching that a number should alwaies of necessitie receiue with the Priest; and that it is of the substance and necessitie of the Sacrifice, it can not be proued. And therefore the ordinance of the Church therein is to be folowed.

Christ (say you) bad his Disciples to do the same in his remembrance. we do the same that Christe did, touching al that is of the substance of his Institution. As for euery Ceremonie which Christ obserued at his Supper, we are not bound to obserue. That his body and bloud be consecrated by a Priest with his wordes, that it be offered and receiued, it is contained in the precept of Christ, as the holy Fathers haue taught vs hauing learned the same of the Apostles, and of the holy Ghost: but that this be neuer done, onelesse there be a number prepared to receiue the mysteries with the Priest: that is not necessarily gathered of the wordes of Christ. For he said not, Do ye thus, but Do ye this, in my remembrance. Oherwise we might seme bound vnto many absurd & impossible things. So then number of receiuers being one of the things, which are lefts the disposition of the Apostles, and consequently of their successors the gouernours

Luc. 22.
1. Cor. 11,

The. 110
vnto truth.
S. pauls
wordes be
not to be
understa-
nd of the
ministrati-
on of the
sacrament;
but of the
holy fea-
st.
1p. 1 Cor. 11

of the Church: we do not offend, ne breake the Institution of Christ, in celebrating the vnbloody Sacrifice, & receiuing it alone when others be not thereto disposed. But heretofore we said ynough before. Nowe geue vs an other cass, for this is not to be liked.

Ieruel.

Likevise S. Paule willed the Corinthians one to vvaite and relie for another * in the holy Ministration, and to conforme them selues to Christes example. Vnderpon S. Hierome saith, as it is before alleged, The Lordes supper must be common vnto al: For the Lord deliuered the Sacraments.

fragmentes equally vnto al the disciples that were present. And S. Ambrose likewise expounding these wordes, Inuicem expectate, I waite one for other, saith thus, that the Oblation of many may be celebrate together, and may be ministred vnto al. 1. Cor. 12.

Harding.

This place of S. Baile, Inuicem expectate, waite ye one for another, is vnderstanded of S. Chrysostome, Theodoritus, and others Fathers, to be spoken not of the administration of receiuing of the blessed Sacrament, but of the feastes, which at that time they made in the place of common prayer, or where els they might most conueniently. These feastes they called *κoinωνιας*. As I haue before declared, where I spake of this place, S. Chrysostom calleth them *κοινὰς τράπεζας*, common tables, and *κοινὴν δειπνίαν*, Common feaste. He declareth they were kept after the Seruice was done, and after the Communion had ben receiued. Theodoritus calleth them Communes coenas, Common suppers. Because these feastes that were wel vsed at the beginning to a godly exercise of humilitie, and charitie, in pro- cess of time were abused of the Corinthians, the rich making cheere by them selues, and contemning the poore, contrary to the example of Chyistes Supper: the Apostle to cal them backe vnto the imitation of Chyistes example, requireth them to taria one for another, and not to sit downe and eate their meat, before the poore came. So this place serueth not the turne.

The wordes that you father vpon S. Hierome, be not S. Hieromes. Yet vnder his name you haue alleged them diuerse times in this Article. You seme to repose greate trust in them. But I marvel you would vse the helpe of such pery Doctours, you I say, that take your pleasure so much at me for byrting in them, whom it liketh not your self to allowe, though of others not vlearned they be neuer so well allowed.

III

But

See before
Fol. 92. a.
Chrysost.
In 1. cor. 12.
Hom. 27.
Theodorit.
In 1. Cor. 12.

Id. I. 150.
vith the
helpe of an
vknowne
Doctour,
vnder the
name of
S. Hierome

A Reioindre to

That S.
Pauls
woordes
make ye
one for, as
other, are
meant of
supper of
Common
meates,
which was
called our
Lords
supper.
Comu-
nem cœ-
nam.
By what
names
supper is
called of
Fathers.
Chrysost.
In 1 Cor. 11
Hom. 27.
Tertullian
lib. 2. ad
Vxorem.
1. Cor. 11.

But who so euer wrote those brieft Commentaries vpon
S. Pauls Epistles, by the woordes that you allege, he mea-
neth not the blessed Sacrament, but the supper or feastes of com-
mon meates, which was called also Cœna Dominica, our Lordes
Supper, because it was made immediatly after they had recei-
ued the Mysteries according to the example of our Lordes last
Supper.

He signifieth no lesse him selfe in that very place, for thus
there it foloweth. The Apostle saith this because as they came
together in the Church, they offered their offerings seuerally,
and there in the Church eating the common Supper, withal they
consumed what so euer remained of the Sacrifices after the Com-
munion. Loe Syr, heare you not the very worde Communem
cœnam. The common Supper? This common supper, which
was named also our Lordes Supper, and is so called το κυριακόν
δείπνον of S. Chrysostom, Dominicum conuiuium, our Lordes
least of Tertullian, should not haue ben priuate to the richer sort
that had abundance whereof they made their offerings, and con-
sumed al them selues disdainning to waite and tarie for poore:
but it should haue been common as wel to the poore, that were
not of habilitie to bring so large and so liberal offerings, as to
the rich. Therefore said S. Paul, Itaq; fratres mei cum conueni-
tis ad manducandum, inuicem expectate. Brethren when ye come
together to eate, tarie one for an other, ad manducandum, to eate
he saith, whereby he meaneth the eating of common meates at
their Church feastes, not the participation of the body and blood
of Christ: although ere they came to their common meates, they
receiued the Communion before. And that it may be thought, that
so he meant, it foloweth, Si quis esurit, domi manducet, If any
be a hungred, let him eate at home. The place of S. Ambrose is
to be vnderstanded likewise of those holy Suppers. Now let
vs assay more of your taste,

Jewel.

In the Canons of the Apostles it is Decreed, that if any man resort to
unto the church, and heare the scriptures, and abstaine from the Commu-
nion: he stande excommunicate, as one that troubleth the Congregation.
The like decrees are found vnder the names, of Calixtus, * Anacleus, Mar-
tinus, Hilarinus, and others: by which it is certaine, that the whole church
then receiued together.

Harding.

Here you geue vs a false taste. Jewell. You haue falsified
the 9. Canon of the Apostolike Canons. parte you haue cut a-
way, and parte you haue falsly translated. The Canon is thus.
Quicumque fideles Ecclesiam ingrediuntur, & scripturas audiunt
(οἱ πιστοὶ ἐκκλησίαν εἰσέρχονται, καὶ τὰς ἀγίας μετὰ τῆς)
neque apud preces & sanctam participationem permanent, eos,
tanquam qui ordinis in Ecclesia perturbatione inducant, a com-
munione arceri oportet. what faithfull persons so euer enter into
the Church, and heare the scriptures, and do not abyde at the
prayers, and at the holy participation (or) receiuing of the myste-
ries: it becometh them to be excommunicate, as them which bying
trouble vnto the Church. The Canon speaketh of such as would
heare the Scriptures, but would not tarry in the Church whi-
les the prayers were said, and the mysteries were receiued. For
that they were to be excommunicate, and not for that they refu-
sed to receiue the Communion, as you meane.

But though euery faithfull person in the Apostles time
used to receiue very often, when fewe were yet come vnto the
faith, and they alwaies in feare of their life through the cruel per-
secutions of the Infidels, vnder whom they lyued: yet at length
when the multitude of beleuers was increased, the rigour of
the order was remitted by Fabian & others, and they were vnder
paine of excommunication bounde to receiue but thise in y^r pere,

Can. Apo.
can. 9.

The. 227.

vntruth.

It is not

certaine

by the De

crees of

Anacle-

tus & Ca-

lixus, &

the whole

church the

receiued

together

at euery

Oblation,

for y^e De-

crete is to

be vnder-

stande of

y^e priestes

& others

of y^e cler-

gie only,

as I haue

prooued.

Ad. Jew.

falsifieth

the Ca-

non of

the Apost-

les.

De conf.

dist. 2. Et si

non.

It is as.

A Rejoindre to

at Easter, wissoneday, and Christmasse. Now though in the Apostles time their deuotion were such, yet when the number was greatly multiplied, the Oblation was at sometimes celebrated, when a companie was not disposed to receiue with the Priest, as it is proued by S. Chylosomes complaint made in that behalfe.

*Chryso. ad
pop. Antio
che. ho. 61.*

By the decrees, that be vnder the names of Calixtus, Anacletus, Martinus, Hilarius, and others (I know not what others you meane) which you haue here confusely shuffled together, it doth not certainly appeare, that the whole Church the receiued together, as you say. And were it graunted, that at certaine solemne feastes great companies receiued, as certainly they did in many places: yet will it not thereof folowe, that within the space of the first six hundred yeres, there was nowhere at any time, any Masse celebrated without a companie receiuing with the priest. That is the point you must proue, els you proue nothing against vs.

*The very
point, that
Mr. Jew.
ought to
proue.
This is
a case of
our contro-
uersie, aga-
inst which
Mr. Jew.
great Re-
pinedirect-
ly bylgeth
nothing.*

All that you say, is to proue there was a Communion, which we denie not. Neither now repine we against that some of the people be alwaies disposed and ready to receiue with the Priest at euery Masse, if it might be brought to passe. But if the people be not alwaies so disposed, and if, as commonly it happeneth, there come none at al to be honored: in this case the Church hath thought good, the Priest offer the Sacrifice at the Masse, and so celebrate the memorie of Christes death not with standing. This case is directly to be impugned of you Mr. Jew, if you will seme to fight against vs. For els your prouing of a Communion is but a needlesse multiplying of wordes.

*The true
understan-
ding of
Anacle-
tus De-
cret.*

Touching the Decrees by you here alleged, they are answered before. The Decree of Anacletus, wherof a parte
is

is set forth by Gratian under the name of Calixtus, spea-
keth not of the whole Church, that is to say, of al, both Cler-
gie, and Laitie: but onely of such of the Clergie, as attended
vpon the Bishop celebrating the Sacrifice vpon sollemne fea-
stes. They were Priests and Deacons. And when the Sa-
crifice was donne, the Decree required them to receiue the Com-
munion, or to be put out of the Church. And that the request
of the Decree pertained onely vnto them, it is evident both by
the circumstance of the place, and by the wordes of the original,
which hath thus; as Nicolaus Cusanus reciteth out of Burchar-
dus: Sic enim Apostoli statuerunt, & Sancta Romana tenet Eccle-
sia, & si hoc neglexerint, degradentur. Let al communicate that
were present at the Consecration. For so the Apostles haue or-
deined, and the holy Romaine Church holdeth, and if they omit
it by contempt, let them be deposed from their degree. Doe, it
saith, degradentur, saith Cusanus. And therefore it is not me-
ant but of those holy persons which were present at the Conse-
cration, and were admitted into the most holy place, as they be,
who be constituted in holy Orders.

The Decree which following Gratian you do attribu-
te vnto Martinus the Pope, willett him to be thrust out of
the Church, that commeth to Church, heareth the scriptures,
& forbeareth to receiue the Communion to enioy his vncleane
lusts, and breaketh the settled rule of discipline. What maketh
this against the Masse, that none may be said without companie
of receivers?

The wordes of Pope Hilarie repozte, that a man sepa-
rate not him selfe from the Communion, onlesse his synnes be
so great, that for them he be excommunicate. They com-
maunde him not at euery Masse to communicate Sacra-
mentally, neither, that no Priest celebrate the Sacrifice

III iii except

Ex epist. 1.
Anacleti.
De cons.
dist. 1. Epi-
copus Deo.

Nic. Cusa-
nus epist. 7
ad Cleru
et litera-
to: Bohe-
mia.

De cons.
dist. 2. Si
quis Eccl-
siam.
Martini
De-
cret.

Pope Hila-
ries De-
cret.

A Reioindre to

except he haue a number to receiue which him. Therefore as we holde with this counsel of his, so we finde it not contrary to that we defende. Seing that then this is not to your purpose, geue vs an other case.

Ieruel.

Clemens
stromat.
lib. 1.

Clemens Alexandrinus saith. After that certaine, as the manner is, haue deuided the Sacrament, they geue euery of the people leaue to take parts of it.

Harding.

Clemens
Alexadri
nus.

Be it so, the manner was so then in Alexandria before Diogenes time, where this holy and learned Bishop Clement lived. This doth not witness what was done in other times, and in other places of the worlde within the first six hundred yeres. And although this were the manner there in solenne feastes, yet this Clement denieth not, but a Bishop might consecrate and recelle alone; when at some other time his deuotion thereto moued him lacking others to be partakers of the Mysteries with him.

Ieruel.

Chry. in 1.
Cor. hom.
27.

S. Chrysostome plainly describeth the very order of the Communion, that was vsed in his time, by these very wordes: The spiritual and reuerende Sacramentes, are set forth equally to riche and poore: neither doth the rich man eniay them more, and the poore man lesse: they haue al like honour, and like coming vnto them. The Sacramentes being once laid forth (as then the manner was for the people to receiue) are not taken in againe, vntil al the people haue communicate, and taken parte of that spiritual meate: but the priestes stand still and waite for al, euen for the poorest of them al.

Harding.

29. Few
forgeth
wordes of
his owne.

These wordes be not in S. Chrysostomes. 27. homilie vpon the first epistle to the Corinthians, as you haue quoted the place.

nor nowhere els I belue. And though he had the like wordes
somewhere, yet proue they no more then we confesse, that the
Communion was ministered to people equally as wel to the poore
as to the riche. So is it now also, at & after euery where among
Catholikes, and at other solemne feastes in many places. If you
say, Chrysostomes wordes are to be vnderstande of the man-
ner, that was vsed euery day, when the Sacrifice was offered, or
euery Sonneday in the yere, and adde further, that no Priest dur-
uer ne might not celebrate the Sacrifice, except he had present
a compaignie to receiue with him: this if you say, we tell you, the
wordes expresse not so much, though they were supposed to be
his, and that this much can not be proued out of al that euery
Chrysostome wrote. Howe geue vs an other case. For this can
bech nothing of S. Chrysostome.

Againe he saith, there are thinges, wherein the priest differeth nothing
from the people: as when we must vse the feareful mysteries. For we are
al of one worthinesse to receiue the same.

Harding.

In this place S. Chrysostome making a comparison be-
tween the state of the new Testament, and of the olde, saith, that
when the dreadfull mysteries are to be receiued, the Priest differ-
eth nothing from the subiect, for so he calleth euery one of the
people. For (saith he) we are accompted worthy of the same selfe
thinges in like sorte. That we are al of one worthinesse, so much
neither the Greeke original, nor the common translation geneth
to vnderstande. In the olde lawe saith he, it was not so. For the
Priest might eate of certaine portions of the sacrifices, of which
it was not lawfull for the people to eate. But now it is not so. For
now one Body is set before al, and one Cuppe.

Here I might demaunde of M. Jewel, what Body is that

and saith
they be
Chrysosto-
mes.

Chrysost.
2. Cor.
Hom. 12.

The 122.
Intruch.
S. Chrysos-
tost saith
not so.
neither is
it vnderly
true.

TOV ΔΕΥΣ
ΜΕΛΟΥ.

Mark 1.

one

A Reioindre to

what is
this one
body
and one
cup, & for
each of
but 1 body
& blood of
Christs

one body, that is set before al to receiue: what cuppe is that one
Cuppe, whereof al do drinke? Bread it can not be, for what one
bread, or loaf of bread, or what body is of bread; whereof being
but one al take their parte: what one Cup is that which generally
drinke to all? Soothly this is one Body, in this one Cuppe can not be
vnderstanded any other, the the Body and Blood of our Lorde,
which we receiue in the Sacrament. Which though it be receiua-
ned of al, yet is neuer consumed. And what if the subiect, of every
of the people receiue this body of Christs, no less then the Body
for that is the thing which S. Chrysostome saith: namely
this any argument against the Masse, as to which none receiued
with the Masse? Whereby I can not see, to what purpose this is
brought in, but surely to proue that the people sometime haue recei-
ued it, which no wise man euer denied. But this is
S. Actols rhetoricke, to bring thicke proues for confirmation
of one truth, to discredit an other truth. How so euer this like
your case, it seemeth to vs not to taste wel for your purpose. For
as sooth therfore an other dish.

I reply.

*2. Gregorie saith that euen in his time the order was, that in the time
of the holy Communion, the Deacon should stand vp, and say alwaye vnto
the people, Si quis non communicat, det locum. If there be any body
that is not disposed to communicate, let him geue place.*

Hereby.

By that place of S. Gregorie it appeareth, that in some
places the Deacon admonished the people to come & receiue the
Communion: but whether the people alwayes came and recei-
ued, and that if none were disposed to receiue, the Deacon should
should not celebrate Masse, and receiue: that are you not
able to proue, neither by S. Gregorie, nor by any other Au-
thor. And this is your parte to proue, which you haue taken in

hand

hand, and now you are bound to let it fall, and sincke away.

But say howe could you finde in your heart to allege that chapter of S. Gregorie, which as it maketh nothing for you, so very much against you? For there haue you a plain intencion of Masse, and that Masse was layd in a Church, and the Sacrifice offered by the Priest for the soules of two Romanes there buried, and that their Spiritues obtained rest, by the holy Oblation offered for them, at the Masse. If you haue no better by the so geue vs a taste of them this that you haue hitherto thought, you may keepe your taste to your selfe, for this sheweth what small store you haue. I thought you would haue deuised some fine delicates, that we neuer tasted of before.

Leuyl.

This Latine worde *Missa*, in the time of Tertullian, and S. Cyprian, signified a dimissio, or licence to departe. and was specially applied vnto the Communion, upon this occasion that I must here declare. They that were then named *Catechumeni*, that is to say Nouices of the faith, and not yet Christened, were suffered to be present at the Communion, until the Gospel was ended. Then the Deacon commanded them forth, pronouncing these wordes aloud, *Catechumeni exeunte*: or thus, *Ite Missa est*. Go ye forth ye haue licence to departe. Of this dimissing or departing forth of the *Catechumeni* and others, the service is saide vnto this called *Missa*. The rest remained sith the Church, and receiued the Communion together with the Priest.

29. Jewels allegeth a chapter of S. Gregorie, that maketh much against him.

This is but a glosse of S. Jewels fantasie. The. 117. vnto truth. It was not specially applied vnto the Communion as you say, but vnto the Sacrifice. And so saith W. Rhenanus, of whom you borrow part of that poynting here, and parte you falsifie. The. 114. vnto truth. That wherent the *Catechumeni* were suffered to be present, was not the Communion, it was called Masse of the *Catechumeni*.

Harding

A Reioindere

Haring.

If in the time of Tertullian and S. Cyprian this worde
 Missa signified a dismissing or licence to departe, and was speci-
 ally applied vnto the Communion; as you say, though vncertainly:
 then was the name by men of that age vsed. If you wilt abyde by
 this, what answere can you make to your selfe in the 17. Article,
 pagina. 491. where you say the contrary? There among other
 things you say touching this word Missa, & it is very selborne
 vsed of the olde Latine writers: of S. Augustine, S. Hierome,
 Tertullian, S. Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, and others
 of that age, neuer. How standeth this together, in that time it sig-
 nified so, and was applied vnto that, and of men of that time it
 was neuer vsed: If it were neuer vsed, the it signified not, as you
 say, if it signified & was appltd, the was it vsed. If what contra-
 diction is this? Such sonde ouersightes men fall into & fall fro the
 Church, and from the Doctrine of & ancient and holy fathes.
 Although I wil not strine much with you about & worde Missa,
 yet that in the time of Tertullian and S. Cyprian, it signified a
 dismissing, or a licence to departe, and that it was specially applied
 vnto & Communion: it is but your gheasse & coniecture. Where-
 in neuerthelesse you follow Beatus Rhennus, out of whose
 annotations vpon Tertullian you haue taken this nor without
 a grieuous falsifying. For whereas he saith, Sacrificio id vocabu-
 lum accommodatum, that this worde Missa was applied vnto
 the Sacrifice, and, that properly Masse was in the time of The Sa-
 crifice, when the Catechumens were put forth (for so be his very
 wordes, proprie Missa erat tempore Sacrificij, quando Catechu-
 meni foras mittebantur): you say, it was specially applied vnto
 the Communion. which is a special vnturth, and a special denie
 of yours to abolish the memoie of the Sacrifice of the Altar.
 And

In scholijs
 Rhennus
 in lib. Ter-
 tul de co-
 rona mili-
 tis. Item.
 in. 4 librū
 contra
 Marcio-
 nem.

And here to aduance and set vp the memoire of your English Communion; you say the Catechumens were suffered to be present at the Communion, as though that service of the Church, which in olde time was called *Missa*, bare then the name of Communion. where enter read you M. Jewel, the Catechumens were suffered to be present at the Communion? were they not put forth of the Church before the consecration was begunne? And did not the prayers said about the Consecration occupy a time, before they went to the Communion? Can you not bring your Communion into the estimation of antiquitie, but by such manifest vnttruth?

Let it be graunted, that as in Tertullian, and S. Cyprian *remissa* is sometimes vsed for *remissio*, so *Missa* be take for *missio*, and then let *Missio* signifie as much as *Dimissio*, a dimissing, as you would haue it, and licence to departe, in consideration of the Catechumens departing forth of the Church, when the Priest beganne to consecrate the body and blood of our Lord: what can you inferre of this? May say you, a Communion, who denieth, but that in the *Episcopall* Church, they retained the Communion? why speake you not of the body and blood of Christ? why speake you not of the Sacrifice, of Consecration, Oblation? Is there nothing but Communion with you? And why doe you neuer declare, what you meane by yone Communion? Can the people iudge you meane any other thing, then eatinge of bread, and drinkeing of wine together in the Church after your new deuise? And was *Missa* (the Masse) such Communion during the time of the first six hundred yeres? O miserable and unfortunate people, that is thus deceived, and lead into damnable errorres by such false guides.

As for the true Communion of the body of Christ good Reader, we esteeme it, as it becommeth vs, and with hartly the

W^m J^h

people

A Reioindre to

people would dispose them selves to such cleannes of conscience, and earnest deuotion, as they might more oftentimes receiue that heauenly foode. But if they can not be brought vnto it, yet is it not onely lawful, but also due for Priestes to celebrate the Masse, wherein that is done, which Christ at his Supper commaunded to be done, saying, Doe ye this in my remembrance. Against which al that M. Jewel here saith of the woorde Masse, maketh no Argument at al.

He seemeth to finde fault with the Masse, because it is celebrated many times without a number receiving with the priest. But if we could perswade the people to come and receiue at euery Masse, that would not content him and his fellowes. For then would they finde fault with the doctrine of the Consecration, as they who can not abide the blessed Sacrifice of the Altar. When would they further impugne the faith of the Church, as they doe busily, touching the true presence of Christs body in the Sacrament.

the marke
that our
Gospelers
shoote at.

The marke they shoote at seemeth to be nothing els, but to abolish the external Sacrifice of the Church, whereby the death of Christ is represented vnto vs, and kept in thankful memorie: to bereane Christen people of the benefite of Christs true body in the Sacrament, to put away quite the holy and auncient seruice of the church: to displace the true and real presence of Christ and serue the people with common bread and wine: finally to bring them from humilitie and the feare of God, to contempt and dissolutenesse, from hollos obedience to damnable disobedience, from godlinesse to wickednesse, from the Catholique Church, to the confuse wandringes of the Sacramentaries, from Christ to Antichrist.

Ieruel.

Further the breaking of the bread, which euen now is vsed in the Masse it selfe, signifieth a distribution of the Sacrament vnto the people, as

S. An.

Aug. in fine saith unto Paulinus, Ad distribuendum communicatur, It is broken to the ends it may be divided. Moreover the Priest him self in his Masse saith thus, This holy mixture and Consecration. &c. be unto me, &c. to al that shall receive it, my salvation. Thus the very name of the Masse, the very breaking of the bread, the very gestures and wordes that the Priest useth at his Masse, beare manifest witness against private Masse.

Harding.

It appeareth that in S. Augustines time when the people were disposed oftentimes to receive the Sacrament of Christes body was divided into sundry portions to be distributed. Now the Church for more reverence of so great a Sacrament, useth another ceremonie, & distributeth the body of Christ, under y^e forme of bread made in little cakes. That place maketh an obscure shew of a Communion of more then one, or rather of a purpose in y^e priest to distribute the Communion. But that he may not in no wise consecrate the body and blood of Christ, offer it up in sacrifice, and receive him self in remembrance of his death, unless he be sure of a multitude to receive with him: that neither out of S. Augustine, nor out of any other Father olde or new have you yet proved. And that is the point, which you should prove, els you spend wordes in vaine.

But as here you have noted three wordes of S. Augustine to little purpose, so woulde God you woulde note certaine other wordes in the same place by him uttered, which were for you to very good purpose. The wordes are these. Eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis, uel pene omnis frequentat ecclesiam. I choose in these wordes to understand that, which al, or in manner al the Church doth commonly beleve. O that you sh^d. Iewel woulde humbly submit your self and your learning unto the Catholique Church, the pillour and sure stay of truth, and woulde with that most learned Bishop choose in al doubts and controversies to hold, understand, and maintaine,

B B h - iii what

Ad. Item.
neuer pro-
ueth this
special
point of
this Bra-
nle.
Aug. ad
Paulinu.
Epist. 59.

1. Tim. 3.

A Reioindre to

what soener al, or in maner al the Church frequenteth, and hath customably obserued. Merely then would you not vpon so light growndes, and persuations of Caluine, Peter Martyr, Hooper, Bale, and others of that risse raffe, with your most certaine damnation, suffer your selfe to be lead away from the Catholike Church into what opinion soener at this day is by Apostates and Rebelles subboynly holden against and in despite of the Church.

Concerning the wordes that the Priest him self saith at his Masse, whatsoener by his booke he is admonished there to say, it is expessed in consideration of them, that oftentimes do receiue. As that place presupposeth a Communion of others bespde the Priest, so it forbiddeth not Masse to be said onlesse the Priest haue prouided him a companie to receiue with hym. As the Masse with a number of worthy Communicantes is a godly thing, so can you not thereof proue the Masse whereat none other companie receiueth with the Priest, to be a thing vngodly.

The blessed Sacrifice is no thing impaired by lacke of companie to receiue.

If the Sacrifice be a holy thing, and acceptable vnto God, as most certaine we are, it is: what reason haue you of all your felowes, who worke al the spite ye can against the Sacrifice: why the peoples forbearing to receiue with the Priest, should make that naught and vngodly, which otherwise were good and godly? Both the vertue of the Sacrifice consisteth in the receiuers, and not rather in the Institution of Christe, and in the thing it self that is offered? If the Consecration be done according to the ordinance and commaundement of Christe, whereat the Prieste pronounceth not his owne wordes, but the wordes of our Lord, saying in his person, this is my body, this is my blood: is it not as good in a private Masse (so you call it) as in a publike Masse? Can the multitude that commeth to receiue, geue vertue and force to the operations (as S. Ambrose termeth them) or worke-

Mat. 26
Luc. 22
1 Cor. 11
The number of receiuers with the priest doth not make good y^e sacrifice.

ful wordes of the Sacramentes? Is not the power of Christs
diuine and eternal worde sufficient to make this Sacrifice with-
out the helpe of others that come to communicate with the priest?
Verely this is a thing very ridiculous and vaine to belene, that
the number of people standing by the Priest and receiuing with
him, should make good the Sacrifice. For so should the vertue
of it depende of the power of the companie, and not of the worde
of God, by vertue whereof the hoste is consecrate and made, be-
foze it be eaten.

Thus thou maist easily see Chyistian Reader, if thou haue
not utterly forsaken the Church, and departed away from the
faith of al the auncient and holy Fathers into the infidelitie of
these Schismatics: how little good this taste shal do thee, which
M. Jewel hath here geuen thee: if thou receiue it, and feede of
it. Duely he impugneth the Sacrifice that is offered in the Masse
with wordes, and which is easy to do, gaine-saith: but God be
thanked, thou seest, he proueth nothing, that is contrary to the
Catholique doctrine, which we mainteine.

Jewel.

Here I leaue out a great number of Councils, and Canons, and
olde Fathers, as Iustinus Martyr, Dionysius, Tertullian, Epiphani-
us, and Eusebius, with other auncient writers, both Greekes and
Latines: thinking it sufficient by these serue to haue geuen a taste of
the reste. Our proues hang not vpon coniecture or vncertaine ghes-
ses: vve praye not aide of sicke folke, Vvemen, Boyes, and Chil-
dren for the prouise of the holy Communion, * as M. Harding is
driven to do for prouise of his Masse: vve seeke not out secret Oa-
tories, or priuy Chappels: vve forge no newe Doctours, such as the
worlde neuer knewe before. as these men do for lacke of others: vve
allege neither Dreames nor visions, nor phantastical fables: vve rest vpon
the Scriptures of God, vpon the auctoritie of the auncient Doctours, and

These be
wordes of
doast whē
the victo-
rie is lost.
The. 225.
vnto truth.
This is a
saunde-
rous van-
nitie. It
is euident
in it selfe
I proue
not the
Masse by
hopewo-
men, and
children.

LL4

Coun-

A Reioindre to

A heape
of Letters
boldly fa-
ced out.

Councels, and vpon the vniuersal practise of the most famous cities and Churches of the worlde. These things wel compared and vveighed together, iudge thou now (gentle Reader) whether M. Harding haue hitherto iust cause, either to blew vp the triumph vvith such courage, or to require any man to subscribe.

Harding.

Now at the end, this doughty Challenger like a Maister of Fence fetcheth certaine flourishes, and so dischargeth his weapon. But thanked be God, his blowes be void, they beate the ayer, they light not vpon vs. Yet like a worthy Captaine, he craketh of his olde souldiers, that he hath leaft at home, which doubtlesse he would haue brought forth into the feeld vvith him, if they could but vvith a bare worde haue holpen him. But Say if you haue leaft out such a great number of Councels and Canons, and olde Fathers, both Grekes and Latines, as you say you haue: in case your harte shal serue you againe to encounter, and trie whether you may defend your first Challenge any better then hitherto you haue done: bryng them al forth in Gods name, leaue none at home: specially if they be such olde Fathers in dede as you speake of.

Albeit I trowe no wise man vvill beleue, you haue any great number of such, sith you make your most aduantage of certaine pety Doctours of later age, of vvich some are of very smal estimation, some of no credite but among your owne side, and that not generally, but in a point or two, wherein they swarne from the vnitie and consent of the Church. For if you had so great a number of the most asscient and best learned Fathers, to what purpose was it to allege Gerardus Lozichius, and Georgius Cassander, being both in many points Lutherans, either of late, or yet liuing?

If you leaft out such a great number of auncient vvriters:
Grekes,

Greekes, and Latines, what an oversight was it for you, to al-
lege such a company of late writers, Schoolemen, and others,
who as they had no great sight in Greeke, so to your fine cares
(I am sure) they sene not to speake Latine? If you could
haue brought in S. Iustinus Martyr, S. Dionysius, Tertullian, E-
piphanius, and Eusebius, as you say: why haue you been so bus-
sy euen in this Article, with Haimo, Anselmus, Rupertus, Inno-
centius. 3. Hugo, Alexander de Hales, S. Thomas of Aquine,
Bonauentura, Scotus, Durandus, Gratian, Nicolaus de Iyra,
Gabriel Biel, Hugo Cardinalis, Speculum Vincentij, Nicolaus
de Cusa, the Glose vpon the Canon lawe, Hermanus Contractus,
Micrologus, Summa Angelica, Bessarion, Eckius, Albertus Pig-
hius, Doctor Smith? These do not I despise, but honoꝛ them,
and reuerence them both for learning and vertue, ech one in theire
degree. Yet whereas your selfe do not allow them in vs, and
contemne them utterly when so euer they be alleged against you,
yon shewe hereby, how little those olde Fathers, of whom you
speake, do helpe your cause.

Your proufes (you say) hang not vpon conjecture, or vn-
certaine gheasses: I pray you say, where vpon hang they then?
Or rather what is that you prone at al? Is not your profes-
sion onely to stande vpon the negatiue, to denie, and disproue?
As for example, touching this Article, that it is not, ne neuer
was lawfull, a Priest to say Masse without a companie of Com-
municantes with him in the same place, and that any such thing
was neuer scene or hearde of within the first six hundred yeares,
which was your part to prone, and which you promised to doo:
how clerkely haue you proued it? what one cleare sentence haue
you brought for it? And stil we cal vpon you, what one sufficient
place haue ye to shewe vs for it. If you haue not, why trouble
ye vs, and with force of the swoorde, more then with reason or

M. Ie-
wels chief
Doctors

The Re-
plier pro-
ueth no-
thing, but
denieth
what is
catholike.

A Reioindre to

learning, dyne vs from that, which we haue had in quiet possession almost these thousande yeares, by your owne confession?

The communion is not denied, wherefore proofe of it is needless.

The communion of Geneva set by in England.

O you say; you haue sufficiently proued the holy Communion. who euer denied it? what nede was there to bestowe so much labour to obtaine that, which is freely granted, and agreed vpon? The holy Communion I say, is sore proued; and of vs al thoroughly confessed. But your Communion of England, and of Geneva, we denie, we disproue and reprove, we utterly deteste, as schismatical, as heretical, as wholly vnknewen vnto the Primitive Church.

The holy and right Communion which we meane, is of the real body of our Saviour Christe, duly consecrated by a Priest, and offered in Sacrifice vnto God, before it be receiued. Your eating of bread, and sipping of wine, which by the doctrine and beleefe of your congregation that holdeth of Caluin, remaine and continueth the common creatures of bread and wine, after al that ye haue said and donne: is not the Communion, which by the Scriptures of God; auncient Fathers, Councels, and the vniuersal practise of the Church, is recommended vnto vs. wherefore when so euer you make prouise of the holy Communion, the same pertaineth not to the prouise of that which you call your Communion. Your Communion is a separation from the Catholique Church the spouse of Christe, a diuision of vnitie, a cutting away from Christes Mystical body: and therefore it is not holy but wicked and damnable, and no Communion at al, but in respects of your owne fugitive troupes.

Your often mention of sicke folke, women, boyes and children here repeated againe, geneth a testimonie of your boyish & childish disposition. It is knowne, I pray you asde of them
for.

for proufe of the Masse. For single Communion or sole receiving sundry testimonies be alleged, for which onely you condemne the Masse.

Two Doctours I forge not. Those whom you with great rashnesse haue condemned, I haue sufficiently proued. I put not the confidence of our cause in visions. If that one vision of S. Basils miraculous Masse, which I allege, serue not, there be other proufes ynough: and your Challenge required but one sentence pardye.

You say, that ye rest vpon the Scriptures, the annient Doctours, Councels, and the vniuersal practise of the chiefe Churches of the worlde. But we say, and now haue proued, that ye are departed from the Scriptures, from the annient Doctours, and Councels, and from the vniuersal practise of al the Churches of the worlde. If it be not so, defende your selues, shewe vs but one Church of the whole worlde accorded Catholike, that euer taught withyn the first six hundred yeres the body and bloud of Chyriste not to be in the Sacrament of the Altare, that viterly denied the singular & external Sacrifice of the Church, that held opinion, that Priestes haue not auctoritie to offer vp Chyriste vnto his father, that a Priest may not Consecrate and offer the Sacrifice without a companie of Communicantes, that vsed to Communicate in breade and wine onely no special Consecration going before, as ye doo, and not of the body of our Lorde.

If you can not shew vs this, as sure we are you can not, (for Church to if you could, you would haue made no deintie of it in your Reply) shew for craike no moze of your resting vpon the Scriptures, Doctours, Councels, general practise of al Churches. As we graunt, for the true & catholike Communion you haue al these, as also for real presence, their new Communion.

The Gospellers haue no other fa-thers, nor Councels nor practise of the Church to shew for their Sacramentarie heresie, and for their new Communion.

A Reioindre to

and for the Sacrifice: so verely for your new deuised Commu-
nion you haue none of these, no not so much as any reasonable
gheasse, but altogether shamefull lyes. This being so, con-
sider thou now good Reader, how weake prouises
this man hath brought for maintenance of
his Challenge, and how inst cause

I had to require him to sub-

scribe, according to

his owne pro-

mise.

Hieron. aduersus Iouinianum. lib. 2.

*Quod multi acquiescunt sententia tua, iudicium voluptatis est:
Non enim tam te loquentem probant, quam sui fauent vitijs.*

That many be of thy opinion, it is a signe they folow plea-
sure: For they do not so much allow what thou saist, as
they fauour their owne vices.

11 JU 62

A TABLE OF THE CHIEFE

MATTERS, CONTAINED IN

this Booke

Abbias how vntuly, and with what smat reason reiected by M. Jewel. 33.a
 Abbias found by thre sundry men in thre sundry places. 33.b
 M. Jewels sayinges against Abbi- as examined. 38.a
 Abbias fained by M. Jewel, to be condemned of S. Augustin. 38.b
 Abbias not reprovod of S. Augu- stine, as M. Jewel saith, but one Leucius. 40.b
 Abbias storie impudently belied by M. Jewel. 41.a
 Abo Archbishop of Treueris. 183.b
 Africanus a writer of Actes and Monumentes in the Primitive Church. 36.a
 Amphiloehus, and the Vision of S. Basil, by what learned writers mentioned. 263.a
 Annunciation of Christes death not excluded, where Consecration, Oblation, and Participation is mentioned. 67.b
 M. Jewel wrangleth about the An- nunciation of Christes deathe, through his owne vnskil. 68.b
 Argumentes meete for Ministers, tinkers, and tapsters. 77.a
 A soliste argument of M. Jewel. 107.b
 An Argument proponed to M. Je- wel to be considered. 96.b
 Agape, Churchfeastes, 92, 143, 305

Audire Missas, to heare Masse a phrase mispoken of M. Jewel, by good witnessse proved. 217.b, 228, b. 250. b. 254. b
 Aulsters and the daily Sacrifice with nessed. 274.a

Baptisme according to M. Jew- els doctrine. 79.b
 S. Benet notoriously belied of M. Jewel. 118.a
 Beggarly, a terme not wel used, de- fended by M. Jewel. 115.a
 Benedicere taken for Coscraire, Be- nedicere sancta. 258.a
 Bernard falsly alleged for Warri- ers. 214.a
 Bellarion declared the vnsforme consent of the Church, touching Consecration. 71.b
 Bodily eating of the Body of Christ proved by testimonies of the Fa- thers. 149.b
 Two waies of eating the Body of Christ, spiritual and Sacramen- tal. 148.b
 Foure kindes of Bread. 167.b
 A Burthen of Lyes. 98.a, 161.a
 Holy Bread and the vse of it. 227. a, 76.b

Carnenale with M. Jewel is the first weeke in Lent. 17.a
 Communion a publike feast. 2.a
 Communion called a feast. 6.b
 Communion is not made a private banquet

The Table.

- banker by the Priestes wil. 9. b
M. Jewels holy Communion, a
 terme uncertaine. 15. b
M. Jewel bestoweth many words
 to proue Communion, which no
 man denied. 55. b
 Communion of the English church
 in Geneva without the wordes
 of Consecration. 80. a. 100. a
 The Communion of the Sacramen-
 taries is a bare Communion. 85. b
 whereof is the Sacrament called
 Communion. 112. b
 Communion what effect it hath by
M. Jewel. 117. a
 Communio in what sense is it one
 betwen many being a sunder. 120. b
 Communion, what it signifieth. 121. a
 what is meant by ech of the two
 names of the Sacrament, Com-
 munion, and Synaxis. 121. b
S. Basil Communicated foure times
 in the weeke. 126. a
 Irenaeus alleged for proufe of Com-
 munion among them that were
 in distinct places, and **M.** Jewel
 for answer scootheth at the Masse. 155. b
 The faithful people do spirituallye
 Communicate with the Priest,
 which receiveth the Sacrament
 at his Masse. 177. b
 Communion of the Gospellers not
 confessed to be better then the
 Masse. 193. b
 Difference betwen the Communi-
 on that is in the Masse, and the
 new ministering Communion. 194. a
 Clementes booke of Constitutions,
 where it hath ben found. 18. b
 Clementes booke anonched by good
 witnesse. 19. b
 Clementes booke why it hath ben
 kept secrete. 19. b
 Chrysostomes Masse not disponed
 by ought that **M.** Jewel saith. 46. b. 47. a
 Chalge made by **M.** Jewel to **M.**
 Jewel not yet answered. 94. b
 Calvinistes whome they haue for
 their predecessours. 168. a
 The proufe of Circumstance of a
 speciall act can not reasonably be
 required. 210. a
 Catacumbes. 213. a
 Comparison betwixt the state of
 the Corinthians in S. Pauls
 time, and the Church now, wher
 in great difference may appeare. 231. b
 Canonical Singers appointed to
 sing seruice in the Church. 231. b
 That argumentes may be made of
 Coniectures and likelyhoodes. 231. b
 Consecration of the Eucharist farre
 different from consecration of wa-
 ter in Baptisme. 73. a
M. Jewels new Consecratio. 74. a
 Consecration, speciall, and general. 74. a. b
 Consecratio speciall treated at large. 75. a. bc.
 Consecration with precise wordes
M. Jewel can not away with. 79. b
 Calvinus strange doctrine concer-
 ning the wordes of Consecra-
 tion. 80. a
 Every pronouncing of the wordes
 of Consecration maketh not a
 consecra-

The Table.

cration maketh not Consecration. 124. b
 Four things necessarily required to the Consecration. 124. a
 Whether the Greke Church do consecrate with prayers, or with our Lordes owne wordes. 124. a
 The Councel of Bangra alleged by M. Jewel to no purpose for proufe of Ordinarie Communion in private houses. 124. a
 The Councel of Serunds alleged by M. Jewel acknowledge the Masse. 127. b
 The Councel provincial of twelue Bishops in Spaine M. Jewel calleth a General Councel. 160. b
 The Councel of Casaraugusta alleged by M. Jewel to a false purpose, truly declared. 160. b
 Customes contrary to truth, and customes agreeable to truth. 171. b
 Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus by whom mentioned. 173. b
 Cyrillus of Hierusalem his Liturgie farre unlike the English Communion. 174. b
 Cyrillus in his Liturgie, maketh prayer for the dead. 174. b
 Julianus place answered. 175. b
 Daily Sacrifice, the Fathers call not so the Sacrifice of the Crosse, as M. Jewel saith. 184. a
 Daily Sacrifice of the Masse, what it is meant by it. 185. a
 Daily Sacrifice, wherof it is so called. 186. a
 Difference between Eucharistie and daily. 186. a
 Daily Bread, Daily Sacrifice, dai-

ly Resurrection. 186. b
 M. Jewel would defeat the daily Sacrifice by a phrase of Tertullian. 187. b
 Daily Sacrifice, what it is according to S. Augustin. 189. b
 A thing may be called daily, though it be not done peculiarly every day. 189. b
 Daily Sacrifice of the church. 197. b
 The Daily sacrifice proued by witness of S. Augustin. 197. a
 Decrees and Decretal Epistles, their authoritie. 210. a
 Decrees expressely mentioned by Damianus, which M. Jewel denieth. 214. b
 Decrees and Decretal Epistles by whom witnessed. 214. a
 The Decree of Anacletus commanding them that be present to receive, pertaineth only to the clerkes that waited on the Bishop at a solenne Masse in a high feast. 210. a, 208. a
 Decretal Epistles condemned by M. Jewel in one place, and in many other places taken to be of good autoritie. 210. b, 214. a
 A true Declaration of Fabians Decrees. 216. a
 The Devils purpose M. Jewel made proued vnto. 217. a
 The Devils conference & Labours together, M. Jewel compareth to the temptations of Christe, S. Ihuane, and of other Saints. 217. b
 Of S. Dionysius, and proueth, that he was the Hieronymus. 217. b
 Hugours chiefe toyed in league against the Masse, W. Luther, W.

M. Jewel

The Table

Netwel, W. Satan. 11. b

Doctors ancient & worthy wils-
nessing the Sacrifice, deuyed by
W. Netwel for lacke of better an-
swer. 17. a

Doctors alleged by W. Netwel. that
he most expressly against him. 71. b
W. Netwel. hath not one alient wo-
etour for prouise of his assertion. 121. a

Doctor Smith. 212. a

E.

Egena elementa proued not to be so
wel englished, beggarly Ceremo-
nies. 134. a

Elementa, not wel englished Cere-
monies. 134. b

An Excommunicate Priest may not
lawfully say Masse. 151. a

Excerisse what it signifyeth in S.
James Masse. 46. b

F.

Falfe tables sorbed by W. Netwel to
cause contempt of the holy Sacri-
fices. 8. a

Feast conceined wout gheates. 6. a
Want of prouise for y holy feast can
not inly be complained of. 6. a

Our flesch eateth the flesch of Christ.
150. a

G.

The gloses sely coliecture to W. Ne-
wel is a ful and perfite determi-
nation. 121. a

Guerricus alleged by W. Netwel. vn-
der y name of S. Bernard. 127. a

The grace of the Eucharist. 161. a
S. Gregories notable saying con-
cerning the Canons of y Fathers. 147. b

H.

Hanno contrary to W. Netwel. 113. a
S. Hieromes & S. Chrysostomes
different sayinges accorded. 181. a

what is that S. Hierom reponeth
in the Romanes concerning pri-
marily at home. 181. b

Hippolytus his phrases ignorant-
ly & malaparty repponed by W.
Netwel. 57. b

Hippolytus blamed of W. Netwel. for
the vse of enim, which is not in
Hippolytus. 57. b

Hippolytus that blessed & learned
Martyr reposed by W. Netwel. to
be but a Dreamer. 60. a

Hippolytus can not seme to vnder-
stande the people by the name of
Bishops, as W. Netwel saith, but
a speciall state of men. 61. a

Hippolytus his words alleged for
prouise of the vnbloody Sacrifice
can by no meanes be wrested so
that they be vnderstanded to be
meant of the people. 62. a

Humbertus. 196. a

I.

S. James Masse of Liturgie. 45. a
S. James is both allowed & disal-
lowed of W. Netwel. 45. b

S. James Masse quite contrary to
this new Gospell. 45. b
Idote is he that knoweth no tong
but his owne vulgar tong. 130. b

Innocentius tertius his modestie.
71. a

Intention of the Church is vni-
forme. 142. a b
Joining vnto God two wayes, by
charitie and in dede. 118. a

Joined

The Table.

Joined we are together through y
 Communion; though we be in
 sundry places. 143. b
 Jew. in the very beginning fal-
 sifieth his Adversaries wordes. 2. b. 4. a
 Jewels chiefe Sophistrie han-
 deth in falsifying what maketh a-
 gainst him. 4. a
 Jew. picketh a quarrel for use of
 certaine termes. 3. b.
 Jewel setteth forth. 4. lyes. thin
 7. times in y^e entrie of his replie. 3. b.
 Jewel falsifieth Lysa. 8. b. 9. a
 Jewel allegeth an unknown
 writer under the name of L. Dic-
 tome. 10. b
 The chiefe fluffing of Jewels
 Replie. 11. a
 Jewel defendeth Luther and
 Satan. 12. b.
 Jewel as though he were mes-
 senger of Satans tale to Luther
 against the Masse. 12. b
 Jewel maketh him self prync to
 the Devils purpose. 13. a
 Jewel falsifieth S. Thomas by
 leaving out a word of special im-
 portance. 14. b
 Jew. falsifieth Augustine, by ad-
 ding of his owne unto him. 14. b
 Jewels two hoze boxes. 15. b
 Jewel commonly deducth his
 Arguments negatvely. 16. a
 Jewels shittes when he seclerh
 his parte the weaker. 17. b
 Jew. falsifieth S. Hierom. 18. a
 Jewel contrarieth him self. 19. b
 15. b 17. b 19. b 18. b 18. b
 Jewel believeth Lazius with a
 most impudent falsifying. 33. b

Jew. sheweth his ignorance. 37. b
 Jewel rashly condemneth that
 for false, which S. Augustine sees
 meth to acknowledge for true. 39. a
 Jewel falsifieth S. Augustine. 40. a
 Jew. avoucheth an untruth eie-
 ther of ignorance or of malice. 41. a
 Jewel leaneeth the manifest say-
 ings of certaine fathers wit-
 nelling the Sacrifice of y^e Masse,
 unanswered. 53. b
 Jew. contrary to his owne kno-
 lege picketh places alleged for
 proute of the Sacrifice to be alle-
 ged for prout of y^e Masse. 54. a
 Jewels common Argument, the
 fathers testify with y^e communid.
 Ergo, they testify against the
 Masse. 55. b
 Jewels Buttes. 56. b
 Jew. believeth Hippolytus. 57. b
 Jew. demandeth ignorance,
 how Christ is offered to Christ. 59. a
 Jew. maketh say y^e Ariana. 59. b
 Jewel seeketh delays, & cometh
 not to the point. 60. a
 Jewel maketh the people joye-
 les and Bishops. 61. a
 Jewels custom is to start from
 that he ought to answer unto, &
 spendeth many wordes in things
 impertinent. 62. b
 Jewel offendeth in that he bla-
 meth in others. 64. a
 Jew. being demanded what he
 would say to y^e Masse, in case pro-
 ple would receive with y^e Masse,
 answereth nothing. 65. b
 Jew. believeth Innocentius ter-
 tius, and Scotus. 70. a
 Jew.

The Table.

- Mr. Jewel** is faine to lye to **Scotus** for helpe. 70.b
Mr. Jewel allegeth the Objections, which the Scholmen haue confuted, as Doctrine maintained by the Catholiques. 71.b
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **Bonauentura**. 71.b
Mr. Jewels owne Doctours make directly against him. 71.b
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **Beffarion**. 71.a
Mr. Jewel fleeth to the late schismaticke Brekes for helpe. 71.a
Mr. Jewel sowly abuseth and corrupteth **S. Augustin**. 78.a
Mr. Jewels manner in reporting his Aduersaries sayings and Arguments, is quite contrary to the manner of all learned men. 71.a
Mr. Jewel addeth to the Scripture wordes of his owne to helpe his bad matter. 91.b
Mr. Jewel speaketh like a man that is out of his wits. 96.b
 What is the special point that **Mr. Jewel** hath to proue, and proueth not. 101.a
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **S. Irenaeus**. 107.b
Mr. Jewel corrupteth **S. Ambrose** with false translation. 110.b
Mr. Jewel perverteth truth, and perverteth vnto. 111.b
Mr. Jewel commonly forgetteth his Argumentes of his owne, and with the same burdeneth his Aduersaries. 117.a
Mr. Jewel feareth not to knowe what he saith, nor whereof he affirmeth. 117.a
Mr. Jewel busily proueth that is not denied, and that is denied, he proueth not at all. 120.b
 The very point that **Mr. Jewel** ought specially to proue in the first Article, which he hath not proued, nor euer shalbe habile to proue. 122.b
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **Dachymeres** by putting in of his owne this word together. 122.b
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **Daimo** by leauing out wordes of great importance. 123.a
Mr. Jewels vniuersal dealing. 124.a
Mr. Jewel reporteth **S. Basil** wordes falsly. 124.a
Mr. Jewel manifestly falsifieth **S. Augustin**, and saith alse Canonis. 125.b
Mr. Jewels tale hangeth not together. 127.a
Mr. Jewels custome through his Replie. 129.b, 131.b
 An inuenientable inconuenience of **Mr. Jewels** doctrine. 130.a
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **S. Hierome** againe. 135.b
 The point wherein **Mr. Jewel**, and the Catholiques dissent. 137.a
Mr. Jewel is faine to run to Schismatiques and Heretiques for helpe. 140.a
Mr. Jewel falsifieth **Scotus**, and vniuersally reporteth his Aduersaries. 140.b
Mr. Jewel scoffeth at a drop of water poured in the ground. 141.a
Mr. Jewel reporteth a great untruth of the Councell of Florence. 143.b

The Table.

- ¶ Jewel labourerth to destroy one truth by an other truth. 146. a
- ¶ Jewel doth ascribe a saying to S. Cyprian, that is not S. Cyprians. 148. b
- ¶ Jewel corrupterth and falsifieth Cyprian. 149. a
- ¶ Jewel falsifieth the whole state of the mater by chāging communicating into receiving. 151. b
- ¶ Jewel starteth from place to place to finde him a lurking hole. 156. a
- ¶ Jewel falsifieth S. Irenæus. 158. b
- ¶ Jewel falsly altererth the selfe by changing the wordes of the Answer. 159. b
- ¶ Jewels impudēt in lying noted. 159. b
- ¶ Jewels common policie to supplye with scottes, wher good matter wanteth. 163. a
- ¶ Jewel corrupterth Tertullian. 163. a. &c.
- ¶ Jewels bragge, (where then was the Single Communion) answered. 166. b
- ¶ Jewel misreporterth S. Basils Epistle ad Cæsariam. 169. b
- ¶ Jewel like to the builders of the tower of Babylon. 170. b
- ¶ Jewel reprouerth S. Basil for making a weake reason, that is contrary to his purpose. 171. a
- ¶ Jewel forgeth a tale of his own head. 172. a. 180. b
- ¶ Jewels premissh reason, S. Basil Sacrificed foure times every weeke, Ergo, the Church hath not the daily Sacrifice. 174. b
- ¶ Jewel belicth Echini, falsifieth Biel, and Vincencius de Valensia. 177. a
- ¶ Jewel charged with a foule lie. 178. a
- ¶ Jewel reprouerth S. Hierome to diminish his authoritie. 179. a
- ¶ Jewel falsifieth and sowly belicth Origen. 179. a
- ¶ Jewel caseth at the Bp̄lates of the Church of Rome. 186. a
- ¶ Jewel ascriberth to his Adversarie sound Argumentes of his owne forgerie. 189. a
- ¶ Jewel sustaining the part of an Answerer contrary to al order of Schooles opposerth. 190. b
- ¶ Jewel misreporterth S. Augustine. 199. b
- ¶ Jewel corrupterth both S. Augustine and S. Ambrose. 201. a
- ¶ Jewel corrupterth the 4. Council of Toledo. 203. b
- ¶ Jewel sowly corrupterth & falsifieth S. Chylosostome. 206. b
- ¶ Jewel repoynterth falsly S. Soters Decree. 216. a
- ¶ Jewel misreporterth Damasus. 217. a
- ¶ Jewel corrupterth and falsifieth al that he takeeth in hande. 218. b
- ¶ Jewel vitererth two sowle vinturthes at once vpon a Decree of Fabian. 224. b
- ¶ Jewel commonly maketh Arguments ab autoritate negative. 227. b
- ¶ Jewel corrupterth the Council of Gerunda. 237. b

¶ ¶ in ¶ ¶ ¶

The Table.

- ¶ Jewel woulde proue a thing done of old time, by a thing done of later yeres.** 238. b
¶ Jewel blerh false translation. no. b. 232. b. 241. a. &c. 274. a
¶ Jewel ascribeth a forged saying to Socrates & historiographer. 241.
¶ Jewel falsifieth the Council of Agatha. 241. b
¶ Jewel speaking of the Institution of Christ, leaueth out the wordes of Consecration. 195. b
¶ Jewel maketh al men and women Priestes after the order of Melchisedech. 225. a
¶ Jewel misleth and much abuseth the Scriptures. 195. b
¶ Jewel pretending to speake of the substance of Christs Supper leaueth quite out the bodye and blood of Christ, and setteth forth bare bread. 99. b
¶ Jewel falsifieth Damascē. 249. a
¶ Jewel falsifieth the Council of Laodicea by false translation. 250. a
¶ Jewel falsifieth the Decree of Felix. 250. a
¶ Jewel taketh exception against places, namely Alexandria. 259. b
¶ Jewel altereth the state and purport of his Challenge. 259. b
¶ Jewel of set purpose falsifieth the Tripartite historie. 260. a
¶ Jewel allegeth Decrees for him whose wordes being contrary to him, he is ashamed to utter. 260. b
¶ Jewel sicketh at a yere or two, as though for the diuersitie of time the Masse were good of it. 261. b
¶ Jew falsifieth Gregorius Prefbyter, by adding vnto him wordes of his owne. 266. b
¶ Jewel with many unnecessary wordes, proueth that S. Chrysostome could not be alone, where as he tooke vpon him to proue, that he could not receiue the Communion alone. 271. a
¶ Jewels simple argument to proue that S. Chrysostom had alwaies a company to receiue with him. 271. b
¶ Jewel goeth not directly to the purpose. 271. b. &c
¶ Jewel corrupteth the Council of Nice by fowle betwing & mangling. 275. a
¶ Jewel seeketh helpe at S. Chrysostomes Masse booke, whose Masse before he refused for witness of the Sacrifice. 277. a
¶ Jewel falsifieth S. Chrysostom by wordes of his owne additiō. 281. a
¶ Jewel patcheth peeces of S. Chrysostomes sentences together, and thereby corrupteth and falsifieth his meaning. 287. a
¶ Jewel would haue vs dyne al Gods people out of the Church, that do not receiue. 291. b
¶ Jew falsifieth al that he taketh in hande. 296. a
¶ Jewel deliterh in a vaine toy of his No body. 297. b
¶ Jewels craft and lye. 301. a
¶ Jewels very fond deuise. 301. a
¶ Jewel falsifieth the Canons of the Apostles. 307. a
¶ Jew. in his whole Replie, bringeth nothing directly against the special case of state of our controuersie touching & he calleth private

The Table.

- late Masse. 307. b
 M. Jew. forgeth wordes upon S.
 Chrysostome. 309. a
 L
 Leo the busines translatour of S.
 Chrysostomes Masse. 48. b
 Limina Petri & Pauli, what thereby
 is signified. 213. a
 Razius most impudently belyed of
 M. Jewel. 33. b
 Lyes make no psonse. 144. b
 M
 Masse in what respect it is pub-
 lique. 2. a
 Masse publique, though the Priest
 receiveth alone. 2. a
 Masse by M. Jewel acknowledged
 and confessed to have ben in the
 primitive Church. 15. a
 The name Massa, founde in sundry
 old writers and Councils. 20. a
 Masse taketh not his name of the
 imperfectiō of the people, as M.
 Jewel pretendeth. 95. a
 The hoste of Sacrifice of the Crosse
 and of the Masse is one. 105. b
 The difference between S. Justins
 Masse and the new English Com-
 munion. 161. b
 Masse impugned for the Sacrificers
 sake. 194. b
 A manifest testimony for y^e Masse. 201
 The substance of the Masse consid-
 ered according to Chyisties exāple
 of the Supper. 304. b
 S. Augustines mother had Masse
 every day. 292. a
 Masse in the oldest church sometime
 celebrated after noone. 255. a
 Masse at Rome in and before Ma-
 mas time. 217. b
 Masse is not Masse by M. Jew. 242
 A probable argument for proufing
 private Masse. 256. a
 Massa how many waies it may be
 taken after M. Jewels shitting
 denise. 240. b
 Married men how they may become
 vertuous, a brieve lesson. 187. b
 Martialis what he was. 43. b
 The marke that our new Gospel-
 lers shoote at. 311. b
 The marke that M. Jewel ought
 to shoote at. 88. a
 Matiscoria, a Citie of Fraunce, not
 of Italie, as M. Jewel saith. 139. a
 Maximilla what a woman she was
 by report of Abdias. 41. a
 Ministratio, a word glosely bled
 by M. Jew. to diversiments. 217. a
 Mixture of water with the wine in
 the Sacrifice. 138. b. 295. a
 Mixture of the chalice is our lordes
 traditiō, and obserued in al chur-
 ches. 139. a. 80
 Mixture witnessed to have ben v^e
 niuersal. 140. a
 Monasteries in the Apostles time,
 and of what sorte. 45. b. 46. a
 Sir Tho. More reponerth sayned
 Miracles in his Dialogue. 9. a
 The doctrine of our holy Mysteries
 haue ben kept rather by secret tra-
 ditiō, the by publique writing. 49. a
 How Chyisties exāple is to be follow-
 ed touching y^e holy mysteries. 196. a
 N
 Nicolaus de Cusa is drawn in
 to help M. Jewel, where
 of purpose he impugneth this
 new Gospel. 185. a
 Neuer was it granted to the
 Priestes of Norway to confe-
 crate the Mystical Cuppe

The Table.

without wine, as **M. Jewel** al-
legeth out of **Volaterranus**. 131. a
Rouatus came to Rome in y^e time
of **Fabianus**, which **M. Jewel** de-
nyeth. 214. a
Notaries in the **Primitive Church**
appointed to register and record
the Actes of **Martyrs**. 34. b
Number of Communicantes with
the Priest in one place, is not ne-
cessary. 88. b
The lacke of **Number** of Commu-
nicantes ought not to stay the ce-
lebration of the unbloudy Sa-
crifice. 90. b
The place of **S. Paul**, vvaite ye one
for an other. pponeth not that of
necessitie a number ought to com-
municate together in the same
place. 92. b
That **Number** of Communicantes
be together in one place, is by
M. Jewels graunt but a Civile
politic. 133. b
The place of **S. Basil** touching the
number of, 11. receiuing together
declared. 114. b
M. Jewels simple argument, for
necessitie of a **Number** to receiue
the Communion together in one
place. 117. a

O

Oblatio of **Christ** how it is made
to **Christe**. 59. b
Oblation none other acknowledged
by the Gospellers the that which
the Jewes had in the olde lawe.
82. b
what is that the Gospellers offer
by. 83. a

Oblation peculiar of the new Te-
stament. 115. b
Oblation of the Altar made by the
and women as **M. Jewel** de-
nyeth, and that after the order of
Malchisedech. 214. a
Great difference to be noted between
Oblation and Sacrifice. 215. a
Oblation what it is properly. 215. b
Oblation and gifte taken for one
thing. 215. b
Oblation of the people of what
things was it made in old time.
216. b
Oblation made by the people every
Sunday. 216. b
Oblation of the Altar before Con-
secratio, wherof it is so called. 217. a
Oblation of the Altar made by the
people what it was. 218. b
Oddes between these two wordes,
some and the. 204. a
Orationes taken for the wordes of
Consecration. 213. a
The oddes between our Masse, of
S. Chrysostomes Masse, and the
new Communion of England.
294. a

P

Passion Sunday, Fornite, good
Friday. 17. a
Participation what it signifyeth.
86. b
The Pater noster said in the Masse,
by the people in **Seke** church,
by the priest only in the **Lancie**
Church. 217. b
Highnes oftentimes denyed by **M.**
Jewel. 118. a
By **Dachymetris** **M. Jewel** is that
by

The Table.

Is contained in the very Chapter
that he allegeth for him self. 111. b
That condition of place is of the
Ceremonies of the side Lawe. 133. b
Choice of place to say Masse in, is
of Ecclesiastical Order. 136. b
The places that S. Basil and S.
Gregorie Nazianzen went vnto
for learning. 164. b
Howe to be turned poore of ne-
dy, rather then beggarly. 135. a
Prayers for the dead, made in the
Liturgie of Cyrillus of Ierusa-
lem. 154. b
Prayers for the dead in S. Chrysos-
tomes Masse. 184. a. 194. b
Prayer to our Lady the virgin
Mary. 194. b
Prestentes called Eulogie, and Be-
nedictiones, but neuer Eucharis-
tia. 154. b
Private vsage of a thing common
in it selfe, doth not make it pri-
uate. 6. b
Private Masse by an argument pro-
ued to be lawfull. 88. b. 104. b
Private Masse acknowledged, and
in what sense. 94. b
In what sense it may be said, the
negligence of the people is cause
of private Masse. 95. a
S. Ieroms common sayer, what
he is not able to answer, to say
of it, that it pponeth not private
Masse. 158. b. 9c
By private Masse two things
vnderstanded, the Sacrifice, and
the Priestes sole receiuing. 111. a
Benefice receiued by prayers than

gde the tongue they be made in,
be not vnderstanded. 119. a

R

The cause why they Receiue
more seldom now, then they
did in the Primitive Church. 107. a
The worthy Receiuing of the ble-
sed Sacrament worketh our ioy-
ning with God. 118. a
The benefite of the blessed Sacra-
ment worthily Receiued. 116. a
S. Ierom can shew no cause, why
the Priest may not receiue alone,
hauing none others to receiue
with him. 130. b
Christes body is receiued into our
bodies. 148. a
One may receiue, and forbeare re-
ceiuing of the Sacrament with
good deuotion.
That thing is receiued with the
mouth, that is belieued with faith
150. a
Receiuing together, and Commun-
icating together noted to be di-
uerse. 151. b
How the faithfull people receiue the
Communion, by that the priestes
do worthily receiue. 178. a
That the more parte of the people
receiued the Sacrament seldom
in the time of the Council of A-
gatha. 236. b
The Reply of S. Ierom is contra-
ry to the Challenge of S. Ierom.
185. b
Reseruation of the Sacrament vs-
ed in the Greeke church. 110. b
Reseruation pposed by the Nicene
Council. 175. a
R. 1 The

The Table.

- T**he Sacrifice is unlike. 5. b
The Sacrifice of the Church is offered by the whole Church. 10. a
The Sacrifice is not to be said only but also to be done or made. 16. a
How the sacrifice is made by man. 19. a
The Sacrifice of the Church is commonly called the Masse. 19. b
Sacrifice taken two waies. 22. b
The Sacrifice of the Church pronounced. 23. b. 3c.
The Sacrifice of the new Communion. 25. a
The Sacrifice of Christ at his supper acknowledged by the old Fathers. 26. b
The Sacrifice of the Altar witnessed by sundry olde Doctours. 50. a. 283. a
M. Jewels blasphemous railing at the blessed Sacrifice of the Masse. 67. a
Sacrifice Propitiatorie. 84. a
The Sacrifice wheretoze it is to be celebrated. 131. a
They that attend vpon wedlocke worke can not offer Sacrifices. 181. a
M. Jewel saith the Sacrifice of the Masse to be iniurious to the Sacrifice of the Crosse, contrary to S. Augustin. 187. b
The Doute of Sacrifice one entry where. 192. b
Sacrifice alwaies requireth receiving. 298. a
The continual Sacrifice that according to the saying of Daniel, shal be taken away for a time. 197. b
M. Jewels intent touching the Sacrifice. 286. b
The faith of the Latin Church concerning the Sacrifice. 209. a
Sacrifice, what it is properly. 225. a
Sacrifices are offered by blood or fyre. 225. b
Sacrifice and gift are sometimes founded, and vsed indifferently one for an other. 226. a
Touching the blessed Sacrament, some thinges be of precept, some thinges be of examples only. 211. a
M. Jewel wil haue the worde Eucharistia, to signifie not the blessed Sacrament, but comon bread sent for a present. 154. a
Why the Sacrament is not carried home from the Church now as in olde time. 191. a
What was meant by the Deacons proclamation, Sancta sanctis. 280. b
Satans tale against the Masse to Luther, by M. Jewels reporte. 12. b
Scripture by a peculiar phrase retaineth the names of things once changed. 167. b
The Seruice of the Church in a learned tongue is not impugned by the 14. chapter of S. Paule to the Corinthians. 230. a. 3c.
It is not to be taken as false, that is reported in Secrete and vnallowen Scriptures called Apocrypha. 39. b
Sole receiuing M. Jewel maketh to haue been an abuse, with the only auctoritie of his own word. 172. b
Sole receiuing or to receive alone, is absolutely lausful. 189. b
How the prouises of Sole receiuing serue

The Table.

serue for prouises of priuate Masse	210. b	Councel of Florence.	43. b
An Argument prouing the Priestes Sole receiuing at Masse, which M. Jewel calleth priuate Masse.	211. b	V	
Solennia, what the woorde signifieth.	216. b	Visions of Devils permitted by God to the exercise of his Saintes,	14. a
A special presence of Christ acknowledged by S. Chrysostome to be in the Sacrament.	228. a	Visions haue euer ben mockte of Heretiques.	267. a
After the minde of S. Augustin the Church continueth by most certaine Successions of Bishoppes.	42. a	We are vnitied to Christ two waies, spirituallly only, and according to the flesh.	146. b
The state of the first Article.	93. b	M. Jew laboureth to disproue our natural vnitie with Christ by prouise of our spirituall vnitie, & so to beare ouer one Truth by another Truth.	147. b
The Gospellers in their Supper do celebrate an eating and drinking, they celebrate not the Sacrifice.	16. a	The meaning of S. Pauls words waite ye one for an other.	93. a
Synaxis, collecta, colligere, what they signifie.	257. a	What wil followe, if what so euer Christ said not expressly, it may be done.	77. a
T		Visions and apparitions made to holy men.	267. a
Transubstantiations woorde ascribed to God only.	142. b	winding vp of a mater, a good english terme, wherat M. Jewel scoffeth.	268. b
The faith of Transubstantiation general to al times and places.	143. a	Waite ye one for an other. 1. Cor. 11	
The question of Transubstantiation moued, but not debated in the		is to be expounded of the holy Church feastes commonly called Agapæ.	306. a. & c.

Tametsi liber iste lectus & approbatus sit à viris Theologia & Idiomatis Anglici peritisimis, author tamen M. N. Thomas Hardingus eius apud nos est fidei & eruditionis, vt solum eius nomen nobis sufficiat, vt eius opera tunc euulgari possint.

*Ita testor, Cunerus, Pastor
S. Petri Louanij. 7. Maij.
Anno. 1566.*